The Nation

Vol. CIII NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 31, 1916 No. 2670

Summary of the News

President Wilson is still laboring over the railway crisis, though, as we write, the situation seems not to have advanced far beyond the stage which we described last week. The men are still holding out for an eight-hour day, and the railway heads are convinced that arbitration is the best means of settlement. The President, by his speedy espousal of the short day, laid himself open to the charge from the owners that certain concessions should likewise be made to them. To avert a deadlock, Mr. Wilson on Saturday consulted with Senator Newlands to see whether Congress before its adjournment could not be induced to pass some legislation looking to an alleviation of the railways' present burden; specifically to a definite promise that freight-rates would be raised. In Mr. Wilson's plan was also the thought of a bill providing for a permanent arbitration board to hear similar disputes. As the bill which the President endeavored to amend is in the Senate, after having passed the House, it seemed quite improbable that the question could be threshed out anew at this session of Congress.

On Monday afternoon Mr. Wilson again summoned the railway presidents to a conference, and it here transpired that the brotherhoods had already issued a secret order calling a general strike to begin at 7 o'clock A. M. on Labor Day. The brotherhood heads were summoned to the White House on Monday evening and, admitting the authenticity of the strike order, refused to rescind it. Owing to the possibility of a tie-up in a few days, the railway presidents told Mr. Wilson that it was imperative that they should return to protect their properties. Mr. Wilson has announced that he will go before Congress to ask for legislation to prevent the strike.

The most important item in the news of the war is undoubtedly the official announcement received from Berlin on Monday morning that on the evening of the previous day Rumania had declared war on Austria-Hungary, the decision having been reached at a meeting of the Crown Council held at Bucharest on Sunday morning. Precisely what has led Rumania to this action is not entirely clear, though two circumstances must certainly have had a strong influence. The first is, of course, Italy's declaration of war on Germany, in which the Italian Government on Sunday stated through the Swiss Government that it considered itself from August 28 at war with the German Empire, Italy's announcement being necessitated by her entrance into the campaign on the Salonica front. It will be remembered that when Italy first took up arms it was a foregone conclusion in certain quarters that Rumania would do likewise, so closely bound up with each other did the interests of the two countries appear. The other circumstance is the recent efforts of Russia to clear of hostile forces the Rumanian border in southern Bukowina. The expected happened when Germany retaliated by her declaration of war against Rumania; and it was announced on Monday that fighting had already begun on the frontier of Transylvania. The attitude of Turkey and Bulgaria towards this new situation has not been officially announced.

Now that Rumania is to be counted upon, the position of the Allies in the near east appears to be materially strengthened. Thus Bulgaria must almost certainly recall some of her troops from the Salonica front. The inducement to Greece to enter the war on the side of the Allies is also increased. Even now the report is significant that Gen. Moschopoulos, an avowed friend of the Entente Powers, has been appointed chief of staff of the Greek army. The position of Greece has been rendered particularly critical during the past week by the endeavor of Bulgaria to occupy the Greek port of Kavala, by which she has come into direct clash with Greek garrisons. If, as seems likely, it is Bulgaria's intention to despoil Greece of envied territory, the latter country will find it most difficult to refrain from war. A gigantic demonstration took place before the residence of Venizelos when he proposed the sending of a committee to the King to urge him to prepare the army for "a possible rupture of existing conditions."

On the western front the British have advanced steadily in their attack upon the important stronghold at Thiepval. It is known that Germany, in her defensive campaign, had strongly fortified this town, and its capture by the British, which now seems inevitable, will mean a considerable loss to her. A particularly vivid description of the manner in which trench after trench in this vicinity has been wiped out by artillery fire was printed in the New York *Times* of Sunday. Progress is also noted in the region of Ginchy and Guillemont, and Allied troops have now progressed beyond Maurepas.

Congress, which despaired of adjourning before September 9, suddenly busied itself to such a degree that it planned to finish its session next Friday. Whether the railway crisis, together with the President's request for new legislation, will mean a postponement, is not as yet certain.

The names of the three American members of the International Joint Commission created to compose the differences existing between the American and Mexican Governments were given out by Secretary Lansing shortly after the *Nation* went to press last week. They are: Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior; George Gray, of Wilmington, Del., former member of the judiciary and until recently Judge of the Third Judicial Circuit, and Dr. John R. Mott, of New York, general secretary of the International Committee of Young Men's Christian Associations. To make the record complete we give the names of the Mexican members, which were announced several weeks ago: Luis Cabrera, Minister of Finance in Carranza's Cabinet; Alberto Pani, President of the Mexican National Railways, and Ignacio Bonillas, Sub-Secretary in the Mexican Department of Communications.

A semi-official telegram from Berlin, dated August 23, admitted that on the preceding Saturday the German battleship Westfalen had been hit and slightly damaged by a British torpedo. On August 26 it was officially announced from London that a British naval auxiliary, Duke of Albany, had been torpedoed in the North Sea, with the loss of her commander and twenty-three men. Italians also suffered the loss of the steamer Erix, of 885 tons gross, and of the sailing vessel Dea, of 167 tons gross. On the night of August 24 German airships perpetrated a raid on the east and southeast coasts of England; no casualties were reported. This was in addition to an attack the preceding night by an airship which dropped bombs in the fields on the east coast. In return British aeroplanes made a dash over Belgium, penetrating to the vicinity of Namur, thirty-six miles southeast of Brussels, and bombarding sheds of German airships.

All Germany is rejoicing over the safe return of the Deutschland, which reached the mouth of the River Weser on the afternoon of August 23, having travelled only 100 miles under water.

President Wilson has succeeded in saving the provisions of the General Revenue bill for the creation of a permanent non-partisan Tariff Commission. Senator Underwood, in the discussion on this measure, caused something of a scandal in Congress by rejecting the decision of the party caucus and registering his disapproval of the provision which puts a tax on dyestuffs. Mr. Underwood maintains that in certain features of the bill the Democratic party is at variance with its traditional policy.

Dr. Karl Liebknecht, leader of the Socialist party in Germany, who appealed against his sentence of treason, has received a new and severer sentence of four years and one month of penal servitude and expulsion from the army. On the other hand, no treason, as we write, has been charged against Cardinal Mercier because of the stirring address which he delivered in the Cathedral at Brussels on July 21, which was the eighty-sixth anniversary of the declaration of Belgian independence. We commend to our readers the text of the address, which was published in translation in the New York *Times* of August 27.

As a result of negotiations carried on between the British and Swedish Governments, the correspondence relating to which has now been made public, Sweden has released 60,000 parcels destined for Russia, under an agreement with Great Britain to submit the matter to arbitration after the war. The Swedish seizures had been in retaliation for British interference with the parcel post between Sweden and the United States.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Week

Most American difficulties of government have to do with disentangling a great national interest from a multiplicity of local interests. This is exemplified under our eyes in the efforts of President Wilson to prevent the railway strike. It is especially illustrated in the reported attitude of members of Congress. The President has been consulting them with reference to measures that might be good, not only for the existing emergency, but for any that may arise in the future. Here, certainly, is a national interest, if there ever was one. Mr. Wilson acts and speaks in the name of the whole country. And there is no doubt that the whole country would approve, and breathe easier, if in the face of all the medley of conflicting claims a fixed and guiding principle could be enacted into law. It might be a statute modelled on the Canadian plan, establishing arbitration as the recognized method of settling labor disputes, and making it a misdemeanor for railway employees to strike, or the companies to lock their men out, until after official inquiry and arbitration had been fully tried out. On plans like these President Wilson is understood to have been sounding Representatives and Senators.

With what result? If we may believe the Washington dispatches, not a very encouraging one. Members of Congress are reported to be afraid of the labor vote. There we have it—a local interest against the national interest. Now, for a given Representative or an occasional Senator, the hostility of the labor unions may be a serious matter. In his district, or his State, it might have a decisive influence upon his particular political career. But nationally this has never been so. All attempts to win, or to "deliver," the labor vote the country over have hitherto failed. No Presidential candidate has ever been defeated solely because labor organizations declared against him. When the small class-interest has to meet the general interest of all, it ceases to count. And we are confident that it would in the present instance. The part of the railway employees now threatening a strike represent but a tiny fraction of the workers of the land, and a still tinier one of the entire population. And if President Wilson were openly and boldly to throw himself upon the whole people, it is certain that no group or class, in or out of Congress, would be able to stand against him. The nation would be bound to win a victory over the locality.

The qualifications of the three men named as members of the International Joint Commission for a settlement with Mexico are apparent. For a body whose work is bound to be largely arbitral in nature and to involve problems of international law, Judge Gray has behind him not only the experience of a long judicial career, but his record as a signatory to the Treaty of Paris in 1898, chairman of the commission that settled the anthracite strike of 1902, member of the fisheries-dispute commission with Great Britain, and member of the permanent arbitration court at The Hague. Secretary Lane is known as one of the ablest men in the Cabinet and endowed with a special gift of happy eloquence which should not be out of place in negotiations with representatives of the punctilious and rhetorical Carranza. Mr. Mott, as Secretary of the International Y. M. C. A., has had exceptional opportunities for acquainting himself with the psychology and the problems of nations and rulers. The make-up of the Commission might have been improved by the appointment of an expert in Mexico's economic problems. Among Carranza's appointees is the president of the Mexican National Railways.

For, though the immediate and official purpose of the International Joint Commission is to find a solution for the problems leading to the presence of the American army in Mexico, it is the hope of those who would see a permanent return of peace to Mexico and good-will between the two nations that the work of the International Commission may broaden so as to embrace the internal economic problems of the Mexican people, by which domestic peace and international amity are conditioned. Specifically there should come as a result of the work of the Commission an understanding as to financial aid from this country for the rehabilitation of Mexico's economic life. Our proposals for a Commission spoke of some such programme, and Carranza has not rejected the suggestion. It has been the difficulty of our position from the beginning that, with all good will for the Mexican people, we could not give aid without intervening in their internal affairs, and that such intervention has had to be carried on under the forms of international propriety. It will require ingenuity to expand the work of a Commission for the adjustment of boundary disputes into a Commission for the reorganization of Mexican finance and industry. But with the unmistakable desire of the American people and the Administration to help Mexico out of her troubles the thing can be done if only Carranza's famous point of honor can be kept quiescent.

Senator Underwood's spirited protest against the dyestuffs paragraph of the General Revenue bill recalls the opposition of Republican Senators to the last tariff measure passed by their party. Yet the differences between the two incidents are far greater than the similarity. The Senator from Alabama stigmatized the item as "the rankest sort of protection," but his motion necessarily had to do with the section of the bill under discussion, which was the income-tax section, and nobody expects him or any of the four Democratic Senators who voted for his amendment to vote against the bill on final passage. This vote was the significant feature of the Republican opposition to the Payne-Aldrich bill. Ten Republican Senators carried their opposition to that length. They were Cummins and Dolliver of Iowa, Brown and Burkett of Nebraska, Clapp and Nelson of Minnesota, Beveridge, Indiana's only Republican Senator, Bristow of Kansas, Crawford of South Dakota, and La Follette of Wisconsin. Their action heralded the split that gave the Democrats an easy victory three years later. When we see both Senators from Alabama, Kentucky, and Maryland, and one from New York, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Missouri voting against a tariff bill, we shall begin to fear that the party of chronic disunity is really going to break apart for the space of a campaign.

Democratic insurgency which goes the length of voting against a Democratic tariff bill is supplied by Louisiana; this not because the bill might be mistaken for a Republican measure, but for the contrary reason. Such insurgency is, in the nature of things political, hopeless. But when Beveridge swept the Indiana Republican primaries after voting against a Republican tariff bill; when he aroused the enthusiasm of the State Convention by citing schedule after schedule of the Payne-Aldrich measure and chanting the refrain, "I could not stand for it then, and I cannot stand for it now"; when Taft gave up an arranged speech at Indianapolis because he could not speak his mind without assailing the position of Indiana's one Republican Senator—all this happening with a Congressional election in the making—the cloud on the Republican horizon was visible to duller-eyed men than Elijah. There is nothing like that this year.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It was not a Democratic President who saw his party driving straight for the rocks and was powerless to stop it.

Two bills are before Congress, as a hot debate has reminded us, to strengthen the corrupt practices legislation of 1907, 1911, and 1912. One, the Mapes bill, has passed the House, while the Owen bill is pending in the Senate. Without attaching particular weight to such accusations as those which flew thick in the Senate, it must be granted that some of the objects held in view by both measures are sound and urgent. It is well known that in the elections to the House, for example, the requirements of various State laws concerning publicity of expenditure are often disregarded. A candidate who wins is not likely to take the trouble to file complaints against an opponent who has made a false statement, or no statement at all; one who loses is afraid of being accused of taking his defeat bitterly. The Mapes bill requires each candidate for the House to furnish the Clerk a statement, in advance of the election, of the name and address of each of his opponents. If any such opponent fails to make a sworn statement of expenditures, with vouchers attached, in due time, the Clerk is required to notify the district prosecutor for the United States. The present law requires only campaign committees operating in two or more States to make a statement. It is now proposed to require all party committees receiving or expending money in the election of a President, Vice-President, Senator, or Representative to make a statement, even though operating within one State. The proposed reduction in the allowable expenditure of a Representative to $2,500 and of a Senator to $5,000 is also sound, as are the new safeguards against indirect donations by a corporation. Whether any such radical reduction in the expenditures of the national committees as that contemplated by the Owen bill, to $400,000 each, is practicable, seems highly doubtful.

Rumania's final decision to go to war on the side of the Allies is much more significant than Italy's declaration of war upon Germany. The latter action is merely a formal recognition of existing facts. It was doubtless made, however, on the understanding between Rome and Bucharest that Rumania would join in the war. The whole is thus a distinct triumph of Allied diplomacy. All the indications are that Greece will be the next to be added to what is to-day almost a complete European coalition against the Teutonic Powers. The two Kaisers have now against them an even more formidable array of enemies than confronted and crushed Napoleon.

Upon Germany, the effect of Rumania's declaring war on Austria will be both moral and military. Morally, it cannot fail to be a great blow to German hopes and German confidence. Only a few days ago we were told from Berlin that Rumanian statesmen, being among the shrewdest in Europe, could not think of siding with the Entente unless they were sure that the Allies were going to win. Thus we have the fatal comment supplied in advance by the Germans themselves! Take the lowest view of the motives of Bratiano and King Ferdinand, and it only shows that they believe the doom of the Teutonic Powers to have sounded. Moreover, Germany could not sit by this time in apparent indifference when war was declared on Austria, as she did when Italy took that course last year. Francis Joseph was entitled to call upon the Emperor William for help when the sword was thrust at Transylvania, and Hungary was threatened anew. Accordingly, Germany took up the Rumanian challenge. It would be idle to make military predictions, but it is plain that Rumania will act in unison with Russia, and that together they can aim a mortal stroke at weakened Austria unless Germany comes to her aid. Besides, nobody knows what will happen to Bulgaria. Rumania seized the opportunity to bring her to her knees at the end of the Balkan war, and may do so again. German communications with Turkey may be cut, and the whole German dream of gorgeous Oriental expansion be left as only the baseless fabric of a vision. It is truly a critical hour for Germany; and it may well be that the future historian will describe the action of Italy and Rumania in August, 1916, as sealing the fate of the Teutonic Alliance.

Anything of ill omen in the plurality for ex-Gov. Colquitt in the first Texas primary a few weeks ago is dissipated by the impressive triumph of Culberson in the final test. With the third candidate eliminated and the issue narrowed to that of choosing a Wilson or an anti-Wilson Senator, the Democracy of the Lone Star State seems to have had no difficulty in making up its mind. The voice of even the border counties can hardly be so strong for war with Mexico as Colquitt would have had the country think. But more than Mexico was involved in the contest, if we may rely upon the statement that the "German element" was solidly behind Colquitt. Supporters of the Administration will see in this aspect of the outcome encouragement for November. The issue of "Americanism" is evidently not to be the property of the Republicans alone. Even if Texas had been anti-Wilson, her electoral votes would have been the President's, but it will hearten his party throughout the nation to have this display of unity in the one State where it was seriously threatened. Senator Culberson dispassionately accepts the result as determined without reference to his personality or his services at Washington. It cannot have been altogether so, but in any case the country as well as his party is to be congratulated upon his return to the Senate.

The Progressive candidate for the long term in the Senate from Indiana has followed the candidate for the short term in withdrawing from the ticket. He, too, insists upon his loyalty to Progressive principles, but does not signalize this loyalty by joining another party. Yet he draws one more of those distinctions which reveal how mystical is the Progressive faith. "You are aware," he writes to his State Chairman, "that I was of the opinion at the time of our State Convention that we should only make a ticket with candidates for State offices and leave the people the choice of United States Senators nominated by the two old parties." Being still of the same opinion, he now declines to make the race for the Senate. His action is the stranger in that Republicans and Democrats freely admit that one of their candidates for the Senate is a weight on the other. Besides, it was at Chicago and not at any mere State Convention that the Progressives were wronged, first in 1912 and again this year. This Indiana Progressive is at one with many others, however, in wishing to give up his party and keep it too. He desires the State organization kept intact and a good showing made for the State ticket, "to the end that the Progressive party shall be an element to be reckoned with when the people generally want to be heard in their political affairs."

There is nothing discouraging in the reports from Maine that only handfuls of farmers attended the first hearings of the Farm Loan Board upon methods of operation. Not merely is this the harvest season, and not merely is the fact plain that New England

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

farmers have never been burdened by the high interest rates current in the new agricultural States of the West; the Federal Government would have been short-sighted had it expected the farmers to realize at once the advantages of the law and to hasten to associate themselves in the farm loan associations which the new law authorizes. American farmers are individualistic, and a national credit scheme based upon the formation of bodies of even as few as ten landowners will be slow in spreading its activities throughout the nation. The hearings of the Board, which receives $100,000 for "organization," were arranged for with a shrewd eye to stimulating farmers to the formation of these local associations of the various Federal Land Banks. They will be accompanied by other propaganda, for the law expressly authorizes a campaign to advertise the principles and advantage of the scheme.

You meet Plattsburgh alumni who have brought back from camp the conviction that universal military training is the right thing; not because of the pleasure of it or because of the necessity of it, but as a simple matter of justice. To the young men hiking the dusty roads under forty pounds dead weight and a blistering sun comes the bitter thought of other young men who have chosen to spend their vacations in the orthodox fashion, with a girl in a canoe by day and dancing by night. From all that you have read about the zeal for service and the nation's need you might imagine that with the men at Plattsburgh the sense of their own hard fate would only merge into the consciousness of a higher self-satisfaction. But the sentiment brought back from Plattsburgh in many cases seems to be that sacrifice should not be voluntary, but that everybody should be compelled to succumb to the heroic mood. If pride entered into the question, the Plattsburgh volunteer ought to cherish the distinction of being a better citizen than most men. Instead he asks plaintively and in the vernacular, "Why should I be the 'goat'?" Apparently, the way out is by either universal military training or the prohibition of co-educational summer hotels for all young men who refuse to go to Plattsburgh.

Women may now practice law in Georgia upon the same conditions as men. This is one of the few measures of importance passed by the Legislature just adjourned. A compulsory-education law also was placed upon the statute books, but it is weak. It provides that children between eight and fourteen shall attend school or be taught at home for at least four months in the year. The Highway Commission law, rushed through at the last minute, leaves it doubtful whether the State will be able to claim the $2,000,000 which, under certain arrangements, it might receive from the Federal appropriation for good roads. The Constitutional amendment exempting college endowments from taxation was defeated; a majority of House and Senate favored it, but the necessary two-thirds could not be obtained. The capital will remain at Atlanta. But no legislative session can be called a failure which decided the momentous question of a State flower. It was resolved that "Whereas, in many of the States of the Union some flower indigenous to the soil of the State has been chosen as an emblem of its sovereignty, and Whereas, hitherto the General Assembly of Georgia has made no such selection, and Whereas, the Cherokee rose, having its origin among the aborigines of the northern portion of the State of Georgia, is indigenous to its soil and grows with equal luxuriance in every county of the State," the Cherokee rose "be and the same is hereby adopted and declared to be the floral emblem of the State of Georgia."

A few days ago, how many persons could have said where John Brown's body lies? This is one of the disadvantages of having no Valhalla, no Westminster Abbey—we do not keep in mind where more than a few of our eminent men and women are buried, and if we did, we could not visit their graves without great inconvenience. But there are compensations. No one can question the propriety of laying the sacred dust amid the surroundings which the living man called home. This is especially the case when the dwelling also is preserved, as Monticello. The home and tomb of Washington make a shrine at once national and yet touched with the privacy that the most public character cannot—and would not—quite lose. There is something democratic in the burial of a man who has held the highest place in the republic, in the graveyard of his humble town, amid the mounds of the obscure. And what could be more fitting than that, as in the case of John Brown at North Elba, the place which knew him when the world was still to hear of him should receive him again when his work was done?

Spain also has been having her railway difficulties, of which we have heard little. The recent strike on the lines of the Compañía del Norte, when at midnight the crews left their trains in the nearest station, and the General Union of Workers appointed a committee empowered to call a general strike, has been a complete failure. "The Government," according to a correspondent of the Boston *Monitor*, "applied military mobilization to all men on the Northern Railway who were liable to it, drafted military and naval engineers into the railway service, and the companies supplemented the effort by a remarkable display of versatility on the part of their own people and of volunteers." This imitation of French example proved thoroughly effective, especially as the Opposition under Dato and others proffered its whole-hearted support. But even France seems to have been surpassed in the fact that the Duke of Zaragoza acted as conductor of a train from Ponzuelo to Leon, and later brought back a string of coal cars. At the same time the miners of Asturias struck, but were influenced by the hearty public disapproval to make a quick peace. If there are those in Spain who, as in New Zealand, France, and Italy, have dreamed of a revolutionary general strike, they will be awakened by this experience.

Being of diminutive stature, the Japanese must suffer less than strangers from the cramped railway cars which their narrow-gauge lines make necessary; but there is reported a wide discontent with the economic and other inconveniences of the system. Like other nations, Japan has been taught much by her conquests. She found the standard gauge of 4 feet 8½ inches in Korea, and retained it; in South Manchuria she found the broad Russian gauge and reduced it; and the narrow Auteng-Mukden line she widened. Japanese returning from the Asiatic Continent are struck with the hampering nature of a gauge of 3 feet 6 inches, and the movement for a change had gatherd such force that the last budget was voted by the House of Peers only on condition that the question should be settled by the Ministry. The reasons for hesitation lie in the fact that on 6,000 miles of Government railway the tracks would have to be widened, the rolling stock rebuilt, and tunnels expanded. The cost would perhaps reach $500,000,000. Traffic, moreover, would for a period of many years be somewhat disorganized. On the other hand, the change would increase the carrying capacity of the roads and the speed of trains, reduce working costs, and put at the disposal of Japan the railway inventions of the world.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR MARITIME FUTURE.

So far as present conditions go, it is a charitable view of the Shipping bill that it is harmlessly useless. It was introduced early in the war, when fear of capture tied up every ship of a belligerent nation, and wheat and cotton growers were clamorous for means of marketing their huge crops. Within eight months exports were pouring out in unprecedented bulk, and the "emergency" was gone. The bill was kept alive because the President had set his heart on it, because it seemed a pledge of the Government's desire to encourage capture of Latin-American markets, and perhaps because some Democrats thought that an Administration which opposed protection should seek to remove certain of the obstacles to international trade upon which the protectionist system is based. In its much-amended form, it avoids international complications by forbidding the purchase of ships of belligerents, and guards against robbing our marine by demanding the acquisition of ships not already in our trade. So hard will it be to find vessels that the fear of existing lines regarding injurious Federal competition seems premature. The law will probably be fully operative only when the war closes, and more vessels are on the market; and it may be that the Administration leaders are looking already to *post-bellum* days. They may cherish the hope that with the two-score vessels which the Government can purchase outright it may then be possible to assist American shipping in its contest for a better international position on the seas.

With such hope or expectation, maritime interests will have little patience; they would rather run their race alone, untroubled by meddling which may hamper rather than supplement private enterprise. There is no doubt that after the war maritime competition will be more keen than ever before in history, and that the United States will bear an important part in the struggle. In the last few months American builders and owners have been more and more confident of their ability to take a growing part in the ocean commerce of the future. This confidence is shown by the utterances of shipping men and shipping journals. Every line is being expanded as fast as possible—the lines of the new Pacific Mail, American International Corporation, American-Hawaiian Line, and others in the Pacific; the United Fruit Company, Gaston, Williams & Wigmore, the Garland and Luckenbach Lines, the Merchants' Line, and various others in the Atlantic. The American registry of ocean merchantmen covers 2,100,000 tons, or two and a half times as much as in 1912; and we have building another million and a quarter tons, which is more than Germany has ever constructed in one year, and nearly as much as England. Impartial observers believe that this growth is natural, and can be maintained. A dozen great yards have expanded their facilities by spending an aggregate of over $100,000,000. In some cases the steel mills own their own yards, as with Schwab and the Fore River, the Union Iron Works, and the Sparrow Point yards, while it is asserted that in others great rolling mills have been enlarged solely to meet the increased demand from the Newport News yards, the Sun Shipbuilding yards, which are being constructed at Chester, Pa., the New York Shipbuilding Corporation, and so on.

In all the maritime nations signs are evident of the tension with which the resumption of normal commercial relations is awaited. Practically all have forbidden the sale of vessels in their registry, though evasions of this are possible. In Germany the idle fleet has been kept ready to take the seas, and shipbuilding has gone on steadily—there have been reports of the launching of one vessel as large as the Vaterland. In England the building of merchant ships has been much hampered by the constant work of naval construction and repair, and by the fact that plants making ship appurtenances and machinery have been taken over for munitions work. Last year it reached only 650,000 tons, or about half that in America. But the British are having ships built in Japan, where there are reported to be more than twice as many yards as before the war, in China, and elsewhere; while the rearrangement of British lines for competitive ends goes on apace. The Cunard Line, for example, is reported by a writer in the *Forum* to have taken over the Commonwealth-Dominion Line, the Anchor Line, the Anchor-Brockelbank Line to India, the Watson Company ships, and the Canadian Northern ships. Great Britain has a tonnage of 21,000,000, and she has repeatedly exhibited figures to show that her losses are more than offset by new accessions. The Scandinavian nations, Spain, Greece, and even Brazil are building ships as fast as possible. The real test will come when American shipbuilders have to compete with those abroad under fairly normal conditions. Labor is higher here, but more efficient; our steel plates ought at least to be cheaper at home than abroad; and we have many new advantages in the concentration of capital upon previously uncoördinated phases of shipbuilding and outfitting.

The chief reason why American capital did not enter ocean commerce before the war is shown in the estimate of the marine journal, *Fairplay*, that the average dividends of eighty-seven lines of British cargo steamers in the years 1904-1914 were less than 5½ per cent. We were engrossed in railway building, while we did not suffer from the fact that over nine-tenths of our imports and exports were carried in foreign bottoms, for the freight charge amounted to but about 3 per cent. of the total value of cargoes. For two or three years after the war marine trade is likely to be perceptibly disorganized, and its profits very high. Taking all the belligerents together, a large total of ships will have been lost, and many more so roughly used as to be worth only half as much as before. Lines have been transferred so that one ship formerly in the Atlantic is now in the Indian Ocean, one in the North Pacific now in South American waters, and newcomers may easily "cut in." Our expansion may be expected to continue without check during this period. But thereafter it will require the efficient management that can build many vessels at the normal price and operate them at normal freight rates.

SHEDDING NATIONAL CHARACTER.

These are great days for masters of the psychology of races and nations. It is a leading topic of the hour. Any one who can take you by the buttonhole and unfold to you the mysteries of the "Oriental soul" necessarily seems wiser than seven men that can render a reason. And if a man you casually meet proves to have complete knowledge of the essential traits of the English character, and can tell you exactly what the kinetic drive of the German will impel him to do after the war, as well as how the hidden energy of France and Russia will exert itself when peace comes, you cannot fail to look upon him with a good deal of awe. But when these cosmopolitan psychologists take to politics, doubts begin to make themselves felt. You want to ask questions. When Mr. Hughes, for example, assures us that, after the war, each of the European belligerents will display a "marvellous national efficiency," with "friction and waste" reduced to a minimum, we feel like begging him to tell us how he knows all this. Is it

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by an inner light? Perhaps it is by a "dark lanthorn of the spirit." One suspects this at least in the case of Senator Penrose, who has taken up the wondrous tale and assured the listening Senate that fierce European competition will soon demand the dizziest high protection in the United States.

A singular thing about these metaphysical discoveries concerning Europe is that Europe herself is ignorant of them. We in this country know, for example, that the English are going to drop everything as soon as peace comes, and begin to manufacture like mad. Their factories will be under military discipline, and they will display the same national energy in dumping cheap goods on our defenceless shores that they have shown in dropping shells upon German trenches. All this and many other terrifying things about Englishmen we know, but, strangely, the Englishmen don't know them. They first hear of it all from foreigners. And when they do, they smile. Here, for example, is what one Englishman, Mr. Spender of the *Westminster Gazette*, who may be supposed to know something about his own people, writes concerning this matter:

> I have had a procession of anxious neutrals in the last ten days coming to ask me what we were going to do after the war, whether we really intended to Germanize our institutions, as some people in this country seemed to suggest, and, if so, what would happen to *them*. I have answered with much confidence that the Englishman would, in spite of all temptations, remain an Englishman, and the Britisher a Briton. Of that I am as convinced as ever, but amid all this talk of trade and tariff and education we do need to sort our ideas and have some notion in our own mind of the kind of life we want to lead. Are we to hustle, like the Germans, for any sort of trade at any sort of price, and make the trade returns the test of our well-being, or make a decent and well-ordered life, with spaces for leisure and pleasure, the object of our national effort? To judge from what one reads, every one wants everything at the same time, and we are in some mysterious way to adopt all the German methods, and yet avoid the German results. For my own part, I wish we could improve our education and find some other test than this incessant appeal to trade and material success. But, whatever we do, I am wholly skeptical about all argument which assumes that we are going to *shed our national character* when the war is over.

Anyhow, it is said, the Germans will undergo a mighty transformation. Their whole national purpose, when peace comes, will be to conquer the world economically. They will order the whole working population to make cotton and woollen goods and hosiery and steel rails, so as to inundate the United States. There will be no more political squabbling. The Social Democrats will vie with the Clericals in working overtime for lower wages in order to swell Germany's balance of trade to unheard-of figures. This may be so. Respectable American politicians are confident of it. But it is all news to the Germans. They do not look forward to having their whole national character changed in a twinkling. The subject was recently discussed in the *Illustrierte Zeitung* by Professor Kapp, of Strassburg. He entitles his long article "Der Deutsche der Zukunft." Here, certainly, we ought to get it. The learned professor asks if it is true that the German of the future will be altered "to the depths of his being" by the terrible years through which he is passing. And what is his answer? Simply this, after a weighing of the whole argument: "The German of the future will be very much like the German of the present and the past."

The truth is that national qualities cannot be shed as easily as a suit of clothes. Character bred in the bone will cling to a people through all vicissitudes. Under the inexorable pressure of war great changes may take place; but they are only temporary; and when relief comes the deep-seated national traits will assert themselves. They may do so all the more emphatically for having been in abeyance for a time. Probability for probability, we are likely to see something very different from what our tariff alarmists picture in the belligerent countries. Their people will have many things to interest them more than foreign trade. They will have domestic problems of the first magnitude. Their Governments and political parties will be summoned to a reckoning. The vast burden of war-debt will have somehow to be shouldered. Great social changes will occupy the public mind. And all these labors and difficulties will be faced in the same old characteristic national spirit. When that time comes, our psychologist-politicians will tell us that they knew it all along. That is *our* national character. We can't shed it either.

SELF-CONSCIOUS MAINE.

The Pine Tree State is having her quadrennial hour of glory. If anything, the glory is a little thicker than usual. The biggest politicians in the country speak of Maine as of a Waterloo. Multitudes of newspaper readers to whom the State between elections means nothing more than a collection of summer resorts wade through tables of figures every morning, emerging with the conviction that the election next month will mean something tremendous. Champ Clark leaves Congress to itself for a couple of days in order to set the Maine voters straight. Bryan appeals to them to come out from the wilderness of Republicanism and stand firm for deserving Democracy. Hughes heads for their coasts. Even the Colonel counts them worthy of a speech or two. It would not be surprising if they were a bit piqued at the neglect of the President to make them a visit with a gracious request not to be forgotten. Probably it would be difficult if not impossible to find a man, woman, or child between Kittery Point and Wallagrass who did not regard it as axiomatic that "as Maine goes in September, so goes the nation in November."

Unfortunately for Maine's *amour propre*, as well as for political prognosticators, her record affords no basis for this generalization. The Democrats have won the Presidency three times since the Civil War, not counting the Hayes-Tilden election. In every one of those years, Maine went Republican in September. In 1884, she gave the Republican candidate for Governor a thumping plurality of 20,000, which was 6,000 more than the plurality she gave her own Blaine two months later. In 1892, she elected a Republican Governor by a margin of 12,500 votes, and in 1912 she elected another one, this time by a scant 3,300 plurality. As if to emphasize her independence, she chose a Fusian candidate for Governor in 1880, the year of Garfield's success, the Republican Gubernatorial nominee losing by 200 votes. She elected a Democratic Governor in 1910, when there was no Presidential election, but vitiated any claim she might have made to farsightedness by failing to repeat the act two years later.

Nor can positive conclusions be drawn from the size of the pluralities she gives in September. This was the determining element in deductions from Vermont's September results. The State was sure to go Republican, but it was not sure to go by any particular plurality. Let that plurality be over 25,000, and a Republican was as certain to be inaugurated on the fourth of March following as the sun to rise. Let it fall below 25,000, and the opposite outcome was equally inevitable. But Vermont has abolished her September election and left us only irresponsible Maine, which, having heralded Cleveland's first triumph by giving the Republican nominee for Governor a plurality of 20,000, cautiously reduced the figures to 18,000 four years later, when Harrison was destined to win. By 1892, she had apparently learned something, for in that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

year she anticipated the Democratic sweep by compelling the Republican Gubernatorial candidate to be content with a plurality of 12,500. But the political statistician who reposed faith in her September performances would have had a rude awakening in 1908, when her prelude to Taft's great victory was a slump in the September plurality from the 42,000 of 1896, the 34,000 of 1900, and the 37,000 of 1904 to a miserable 8,000.

Evidently, nothing can be asserted with confidence, as a rule, concerning the meaning of Maine's election figures in September. Hence the deductions from them made with such a show of finality by both parties! In September of 1912, Acting Chairman McAdoo was at the pains of explaining that the huge Republican plurality of 3,000 did not necessarily mean Republican success, even in Maine, in November. The fact was that, as the Republicans were united in September, having agreed to postpone their break until after the State election, their small plurality was for once significant. It was plain that when the division came, the Democrats must win. This year, the figures will be scanned for the purpose of seeing where the Progressives have gone. In 1912, there were 48,000 of them; they lacked only 2,600 of being enough to carry the State. But two years later they had declined to 18,000. Apparently, the lost 30,000 had returned to the Republicans, who had also picked up an additional 2,000 votes. Yet the Republicans did not elect their candidate for Governor, for the Democrats did some picking up too, to the extent of 11,000 votes, enough to enable them to hold the State.

Republican confidence in the outcome this year is based upon the fact that it will be necessary to persuade only 60 per cent. of the 18,000 Progressives of 1914 to vote the Republican ticket. If, however, the figures of 1912 are taken, the Republicans will have to win back 75 per cent. Suppose, then, that Maine should do as she did four years ago: give the Republicans a plurality of between three and four thousand. What would that augur for November? It would show that the Progressives had divided between the two parties in about the ratio of 80 to 20—a ratio which, operating the country over, would reëlect President Wilson by a small margin. A plurality of 8,000, by the same hypothesis, would indicate the election of Hughes. It would be unsafe to say that Progressives in other States will divide in the same proportion as in Maine, yet the moral effect of a sizable Republican victory will be considerable. A Democratic victory would be far more conclusive, since Maine is normally Republican. Nobody will stop to reflect that prohibition has more to do with the Governorship than has even the tariff. And if the voters should elect one Republican and one Democratic Senator, the amount of explanations from Republican and Democratic national headquarters would break all records.

PEACE PROGRAMMES IN GERMANY.

The latest debating society to throw its hat into the ring is the Independent Committee for a German Peace, whose programme, just given to the public, is all that the heart of Count Reventlow could desire. Russian land from the Baltic to Volhynia is to be taken, changes in the west are necessary as a defence against French ideas of revenge, real guarantees must be obtained in Belgium, which "must lie in German hands, militarily, politically, and economically." Here we have the opposite extreme from the Socialist contention for a peace without indemnities and annexations. Between the two run all sorts of gradations of German peace terms, expounded by as many committees and professorial groups, and cast in more or less definite form. The best known of such organizations, the National Committee, holds largely a negative programme. It is positive only in the belief that the Socialists and the ultra-expansionists are both wrong. Its policy would incline towards a programme of compensation at the expense of Russia and of generosity towards the western Powers.

This is the position elaborated by Hans Delbrück, of the *Preussische Jahrbücher*, in a recent article in the Berlin *Tag*. To make terms with Russia, argues Delbrück, means either giving up Poland and Courland or sacrificing Turkey; and either is inconceivable. At the same time, to look for conquest in the west is to annex "masses of hostile peoples which could never be mastered except by the most terrible use of force." To rule them Germany would have to borrow Russian methods. It is different with the western Powers:

> If we simply reëstablished the old frontiers, the relations would be turned in Germany's favor, for France is exhausted by the war and will not present any danger. The chief concession which England would demand is the evacuation of Belgium. No doubt Germany would thus lose an extremely precious geographical position for a future struggle on land and sea. Yet the submarine will guarantee the freedom of the seas better than any treaty.

Now, if one were to appraise the international situation in Europe to-day entirely from this busy discussion of the peace terms to be "imposed" by Germany, the impression would be unescapable that it is with Germany to-day as with the North after Appomattox; that peace was for Germany to dictate, and it was only a choice for the victor between a ruthless policy and a generous policy. Prince zu Salm-Horstmar insists that Germany "will have lost the war if she does not obtain the mastery of the Flanders coast as the prize of victory." Herr Wolff, of the *Tageblatt*, cries out in reply: "One is horrified, one falls out of one's chair, when one reads words like these." But pan-Germanist Prince and Liberal editor nevertheless do keep up the debate as to what terms Germany shall offer. And then, as the debate proceeds, you discover that, while there is agreement, with the exception of the Socialists, that Germany shall impose some kind of peace, there is pretty general acknowledgment of the fact that the necessary preliminary condition, the willingness of the Allies to accept peace, is missing. It is Bethmann-Hollweg's old complaint that the Allies obstinately decline to admit that they are beaten. This in spite of the fact, as one ultra-expansionist complains, that the German armies hold three conquered kingdoms—Belgium, Poland, and Servia. Germany thus discusses peace while waiting for the "final" victory. What kind of victory it is that is not final is not explained.

But that is not all of the puzzle. When one analyzes the arguments for this or that kind of peace, the extraordinary thing appears that those men in Germany who believe that the Empire has done well in the war are in favor of moderate peace terms, and those who believe that the war has not gone well insist upon rigorous peace terms. Herr Delbrück thinks that the submarine has conquered the freedom of the seas, and so he would come to an agreement with England. The *Kreuzzeitung* insists that the submarine is a failure, consequently that England has not yet been seriously threatened; therefore annex everything. Count Reventlow declares:

> Do not let us deceive ourselves. England stands there to-day still unbroken. The much-talked-of financial collapse of England will not come. We must carry on war to the knife and for the whole stakes.

If the financial collapse of England is a myth, if the military collapse of Russia is a dream, if "exhausted" France still stands at Verdun and hits out hard on the Somme, the obvious thing for Germany, according to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Count Reventlow, is to play for the whole stakes.

In this chaos of argument and motive what is the purpose of the German Government in encouraging discussion? Why does Maximilian Harden receive a blank commission to utter the doubts that possess the German soul? The answer is that the German Government is not thinking of imposing a peace, but of arranging a peace. It is not a question of being generous to Russia or to the western Powers, but of buying off Russia or England and France. The German people is now engaged in floating *ballons d'essai*. And, incidentally, by constant dwelling upon peace, the German people may be brought to a longing for peace which will make the Government's task easier in an emergency.

Foreign Correspondence

UNMUZZLED!

By SIR HENRY LUCY.

WESTMINSTER, August 5.

When Gladstone was rejected by Oxford University and went northward to woo a more Liberal constituency, he, making his first appearance on a Lancashire platform, proclaimed himself Unmuzzled. It was an ominous phrase promptly followed, to the exceeding dolor of his former constituency, by disestablishment of the Irish Church and the emancipation of Irish land. Mr. Redmond, protesting against a decision of the Cabinet that wrecked a settlement, arrived at under the presidency of a Cabinet delegate, between the trusted leader of the Unionist party and himself, declared that he and his party, while abstaining from any course inimical to carrying on the war, would feel at liberty, as in former time, to consider the conduct and the policy of the Government.

The state of things in the Irish quarter since the war began, thus threatened with eruption, has been the most notable Parliamentary phenomenon of modern times. For two years the self-imposed vow of silence has transformed what had been the liveliest, not to say the noisiest, quarter of the House, into the quietest. The intermission of divisions rendering unnecessary the regular attendance of Irish members to support a Ministry that had given them Home Rule, they took advantage of the opportunity to absent themselves. The habitually populous Irish camp became a wilderness that might truthfully be called peace. Mr. William O'Brien put in an occasional appearance and made a speech on the current topic of debate into which he was certain to drag the head of his former colleague, Mr. John Redmond. Lacking the incentive of that gentleman's presence on a corner seat on a back bench, he desisted. More frequently Mr. Tim Healy, K.C., Bencher of King's Inn and Gray's, looked in on his way home from business in the Law Courts, and to the delight of a jaded House snapped fortn a genial remark on a casual speaker, much after the fabled manner of his countryman who, passing a tent and observing a head projecting from its folds, brought down his shillaleh upon it. It was drear work not worth pursuing. Mr. Flavin, brooding upon a back bench, thought of days that are no more, and of at least one night, when, at the bidding of the Speaker, he was carried forth shoulder high by hastily recruited policemen, chanting as he went "God save Ireland."

No member taking his seat within the past two years has been privileged to see Mr. Swift Macniel popping up and down on his seat like a parched pea in a frying-pan, what time he shook his fist at an erring Minister of the Treasury Bench. The honorable and learned gentleman has stayed at home, occupying his enforced leisure by writing letters to the *Times* on historical questions or points of constitutional law, on both of which he is admittedly a high authority. Making a rare appearance at Westminster this week, he has done a public service, and established a fresh hold on the esteem of the House, by overcoming strange reluctance on the part of the Prime Minister to remove from the list of the English peerage the names of certain German princelings who, owing to no particular personal merit, had obtained places upon it.

This is all very well for the dispatch of public business. It must be admitted that the muzzling of the Irish members eclipses the gayety of the House. It has been largely responsible for the dulness that has been the marked characteristic of the place through this long war-time. Members listened with mixed feelings to Mr. Redmond's threat of a new departure. Business is all very well in its way. But the House of Commons likes to be amused, and the only section who, seated on the benches below the gangway on the Ministerial side, essay to play the part of the militant Nationalist members are problematically able, but indubitably dull. If the Redmondites were going into opposition there would be wigs on the green, and other long unfamiliar episodes of cheerfulness.

It cannot be said that hope thus raised has been realized. Mr. Redmond, contenting himself with utterance of the recorded threat, has personally abstained from taking part in its execution. The ban removed, Mr. Dillon has lost no time in once more stepping into the breach. But he is too deadly in earnest to satisfy the aspirations of bored legislators. Expectation was raised to a high pitch when he grimly announced that on the third reading of the Consolidated Fund bill he would "have Sir John Maxwell on the gridiron." There was something about this way of putting it excitingly reminiscent of the giant of nursery fiction who, before lunching or dining, was accustomed to remark—

> Fee fie fo fum,
> I smell the blood of an Englishman.

The result was disappointing. Indeed, Mr. Herbert Samuel, who has recovered his sense of humor checked by wasteful excess on the question of registration, gravely complimented him on the moderate tone of the speech in which, later, he redeemed his pledge, and discoursed on Sir John Maxwell's administration of martial law in Ireland. By way of retort the Irish members insisted upon opposing introduction of a bill assimilating clock-time in Ireland with that adopted for use in Great Britain. Polling all their available men they mustered fifty-four. That is a significant result which atoned for some little waste of time. It brought into prominence the fact that though Irish members may bark if they please they cannot in the present condition of political parties bite.

AN ALLIANCE OF THE WEAKER NATIONS.

By ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER.

GENEVA, August 1.

The neutral nations of Europe are already discussing the future effects of the war on their industrial and commercial relations. In Switzerland our leaders of opinion seem to favor some sort of commercial union among the neutral states which shall promote the interests and preserve the independence of each of them when the war is over. Some months before war was actually declared, leading writers in Geneva were advising that a defensive alliance should be formed among the smaller states. These men saw the storm approaching, with danger to the weaker nations—economic as well as political danger. It is now argued that if there had been such an alliance, Germany might have hesitated about crossing the Belgian frontier. The army of none of these smaller nations taken alone would have been a match for the army of any one of the great Powers, but it was thought that the armies of all collectively might have prevented such an invasion, and so might have kept out of the conflict all except the original opponents. Plainly the way to Paris through Belgium seemed to the German General Staff easier than the way through Switzerland; but it is believed here that, had there been a defensive combination of the weaker nations, the Germans would have crossed the French frontier directly, respecting both Belgian and Swiss neutrality.

This view of the matter, widely prevalent in Switzerland, has also been entertained by many in the Scandinavian countries. It is suggested that a commercial, not a military, alliance should forthwith be formed, and that Spain and the United States might be induced to join this international group. Like the United States, Switzerland would be strongly opposed to taking any action which at the close of the war might make the nation commercially dependent either on the Entente or on the Central Empires. With their jealous regard for their own neutrality and independence, the Swiss are anxious to avoid the danger of subjecting their commercial relations to the will or to the rival interests of the great belligerent Powers.

It is probable that the Swiss mind sets a high value upon this idea of alliance among the weaker nations because combinations of that kind have had a decisive influence at certain periods in Swiss history. At this season of the year, it is natural that the thoughts of the people should revert to the alliance of the original cantons Uri, Schwyz, and Unterwalden. On the first of August every year is celebrated the anniversary of the formation of that "pact" which enabled the forest cantons to resist their powerful foes. It thus happens that the Swiss national festival celebrates a diplomatic transaction, not a military victory, and that the signing of the charter of Swiss independence, not the battles of Morgarten, Sempach, Movat, and Grandson, is commemorated with enthusiasm throughout the Confederation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It may be added that this year there is a discordant note in the national celebration. It will be remembered that several months ago two high officers in the Swiss army were accused of betraying military secrets to the Germans. For this they were tried, but were acquitted, yet the verdict did not at all satisfy a great many intelligent men both in and outside the army. The "affair of the two colonels," as it is called, and some minor incidents of a like kind have caused, especially in French Switzerland, a profound distrust of the officers at the head of the military administration, particularly a distrust of Wille, the Commander-in-Chief. To exhibit their distrust and dissatisfaction, many groups of people at Lausanne and other towns in the canton Vaud have expressed their unwillingness to celebrate this year the Swiss Independence Day. Vaud is perhaps the most patriotic and chauvinistic of all the cantons; moreover, the disaffection of this minority among the people has a special significance because the Swiss President this year is a Vaudois who kept silent when things occurring in the army were causing uneasiness throughout the nation. The Swiss press, however, does not manifest any sympathy for the attempt to refrain from celebrating the first of August. Even the leading newspaper of Lausanne sharply rebukes those who would slight the nation simply because certain political and military officials had been unfaithful.

Considering the very critical phases through which Swiss trade relations have passed since the war began, considering also the even more critical situation which will exist when peace has been signed, the foreign service of the Federation is not altogether satisfactory. The administration of foreign affairs is a function of the Federal Council, although one of its members only is the official mouthpiece. It happens very rarely that any one charged with the high responsibility of administering the Foreign Office can speak and act with the determination of the late Numa Droz, whose correspondence with Bismarck forms a classic page in the history of diplomacy. Still less satisfactory is the Swiss diplomatic service abroad. The defect is not in the personnel, but in the organization of the service. In certain important countries the functions of diplomatic agent and of Consul are discharged by the same man. In some cases some powerful Governments have legations at Berne, while there is no Swiss diplomatic agent at their own capitals. For example, before the war Belgium spent more than twice as much as Switzerland for her diplomatic service. The Swiss are aware of these deficiencies, but seem to think that industrial and commercial relations with foreign countries can best be adjusted through the procedure of dispatching special business agents.

During the war, the relations between the Federal Government and the press have caused much complaint. Of course the censorship of news was criticised by many editors. But the Council also complained that it was not properly represented in the press. For a long time one of the Berne newspapers exhibiting strong German sympathies has been regarded as the semi-official organ of the Government. It is now stated, however, that while the several representatives of political parties in the Federal Council have their organs, there is no really authoritative news coming from the Swiss capital. In order to establish a closer relation between the Government and the press, a bureau of information has been established so that responsibility will be fixed when news is given out. This is generally approved by Swiss newspaper men. It will save the time of correspondents, there will be less waiting in the ante-room of editors, and the censorship will be simplified. The method will be by no means so stringent as that now in vogue in Germany and France. The object of the plan is only to insure the prompt supply of accurate news concerning Federal politics.

The *internés* from the several countries at war continue to arrive in large numbers. They soon show a marked improvement in physical condition owing to changed circumstances, and especially the Swiss climate. How severe the mental strain of the war must be is faintly shown by the arrival at Geneva a few days ago of a train filled with soldiers, every one of whom was insane. The *morale* of those interned in various parts of Switzerland requires more attention than their physique. Sir Thomas More, and later Balzac, pointed out the evil of leaving soldiers unoccupied after they were withdrawn from actual fighting, and many means are employed to sustain and improve the moral health of these new visitors. They differ from those confined in hospitals and prisons, in that they are brought into contact with ordinary conditions of life. Many of them have not the means to live up to the standard of their life before the war; and they are separated from their families. Workshops for them have been organized in several places, although the economic objection is raised that they thus become rivals of the Swiss laborer.

An important event to Swiss Catholics will be the meeting of the Dominican chapter which is soon to be held at Fribourg. The order has no monastery in this country, although there are several Dominican professors at the University of Fribourg. This meeting will celebrate the seven hundredth jubilee of the order, which was founded in 1216. Since then the chapter has met in Switzerland only once—in 1473.

Among the subjects most discussed here is the question: How severe should military discipline be in a democratic state which prescribes universal conscription? On this point there is a notable difference of opinion. In the German cantons, except among the Socialists, there is a tendency to imitate the method and the manners of the Teutonic army, and in that part of the country officers enforce certain practices which are not required by the military regulations, such as a certain excessive rigidity of carriage, the striking of the heels together in saluting, the goose-step in marching, and the infliction of unusual punishments. There is also a discouragement of familiar relations of any kind between officers and their men. In the battalions of French Switzerland discipline, if strict, is not so severe; and the public are very restive about any approach to methods commonly associated with the German caserne.

It is very interesting to observe, in a pamphlet just published by a lieutenant on the General Staff who is personal aide-de-camp to General Wille, that the question is raised: How is it that the Swiss people, so unanimously enthusiastic and patriotic at the beginning of the war, now look askance at the army, and show signs of discontent? The author replies that the chief causes are: differences of political opinion, the prolonged service, the excessive severity of the officers, and the seditious utterances of an anti-military press. The pamphlet has not been well received in the German as well as in the French cantons. It would be hard to prove that the army or the people are dissatisfied at the thorough military preparations. Indeed, as the war goes on the idea seems to be more and more prevalent that Switzerland will be entangled in it before the end comes. It is of course impossible to predict what the future may bring in a conflict so extensive and unusual. But from what has thus far taken place, the prospect of the Swiss becoming engaged seems rather remote. There are only two dangers which are at all probable: one is that Switzerland may be so pinched economically as to bring her into collision with one of the warring nations; the other is that when the ultimate *débâcle* is threatened or actually arrives, a defeated army may invade Switzerland in self-defence. It is difficult to see how at this stage in the war the strategical advantage of such an encroachment could outweigh the manifest disadvantage of encountering a new, fresh, well-trained army numbering fully half a million.

REVIVAL OF FRENCH RELIGION—WAR AND THE POPE.

By STODDARD DEWEY.

PARIS, August 12.

Is there a renaissance of religion going on in France? The Union Sacrée has been a good reason for not speaking about it. Jesuits and Christian Brothers by the hundred, *curés* and other priests by the thousands and tens of thousands, fight and are wounded and killed beside the "lay" school-teacher and the Protestant minister and the Jew, with a Freemason corporal mayhap leading them.

Before the war the intellectual and the moral, and even the physical, life of the French people was cruelly misunderstood in foreign countries, as French behavior in war has more than proved. So, too, their religious life was not only misunderstood, but it was commonly underestimated. Latterly, it was mixed up with magnifying legends of anti-Catholic political activity in France. Such activity cannot cease from existence, but it is largely suspended by the enduring explosion of war and danger common to the lives of all. This is, at most, a very negative revival of religion.

Any positive revival which has been brought about by war must be sought in the armies of France, which hold her able-bodied citizens, or in the civil population where women and the ailing are at work with aged men and boys, all "revolving inly the doom" of their people. To all, war keeps ever present the one foundation of religion in practice. "Forget death, and there would be little or no religion," is the conclusion of the English writer who thought most resolutely of these things; but he took pains to add "what religion is in its broadest definition—it is life cultivated under God, and in the presence of death." No one can doubt the presence of death among the French people. Has it perchance been cultivating life under God—or whatever other form of words expresses any proper renaissance of religion?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If the question is taken to mean growth of Roman Catholic religious organization in France, or increase in political power of the Roman Catholic Church, or conversion of professed non-Catholics to Catholicism, then it had best be relegated to some later time of peace. For then we shall have time to study the effect of this war on the souls of Frenchmen and Frenchwomen. The legend that, among French people nominally Catholics, only women practiced their religion and men gave religion a thought only when they felt themselves dying and cried desperately for a priest, was worn out before this war began.

If there has been an increase in the manifestation of religious sentiment—which, if ever, must be sincere now—it has to be reckoned under the head of religious revival. Only that revives which still lives, but in which life was failing and even was no longer perceptible.

The immense majority of Frenchmen, even Socialist workmen, have always had their children baptized and make their first communion, just as was done for themselves by their own parents. When they think of God at all, he is still the Roman Catholic "*bon dieu*," "good God." For them the Christian religion is what it has been in the formularies of their race for fifteen hundred years, "Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman." This is the religious seed sown through all the centuries. Has war revivified it?

Unless a foreigner has entered long and closely into the intimate life and feelings of the French people, and, to some degree, shares with them their spiritual inheritance, he will find it difficult to learn the true answer to such a question. We cannot expect French soldiers at the front to sign a round robin, or French families at the rear to hold mass meetings, to tell the world—We are religiously revived. All that can be done is to observe and gather, with the sympathy which is the first condition of any knowledge of a people's religion, its passing signs and popular opinion.

During the first half-year of war, among the soldiers torn so suddenly from peaceful lives and hurried into fighting and killing and being killed, there was much seeking of comfort in religion. A soldier friend, not suspected of religion, told me his own observations in Rheims Cathedral before the enemy destroyed it. It was during one of the breathless movements of French troops, after Charleroi and Mons. All the livelong night, here and there in the great church wherever they could find a place, by a pillar or on the open pave, fifty soldier priests in their uniforms like the rest heard confessions of their comrades who came kneeling one after the other without human respect and praying for the sacramental absolution. A few days later, in full battle of the Marne, five German soldiers found in his church the old French *curé* of a village where the fight was raging, and snatched the opportunity to make their confessions. It was the death-hour which tries men's souls.

All slept in the swaths when the night was falling.

There is a general opinion, expressed even by well-known Catholic writers of the French press, that this first wave of religious feeling has receded as war became a custom and a routine. So far as can be judged from letters from the front and from the testimony of those who survive, I think this may easily be exaggerated. Religion too has entered into the routine of all these lives "cultivated in the presence of death."

A happy father whose son has escaped at Verdun with a wound and an army citation and honors after a deed of great daring showed me the soldier's own frank, awkward letter. "The Colonel asked for volunteers to try to take a prisoner from the Boches who were firing on our trench from quite near by. Every one offered, and he chose out eleven of us. Then he told us how important it was and that it was very dangerous. One of us was a priest. So before we jumped out of the trench, we all knelt down and asked him to give us the absolution. He did so and then we made one leap. He was killed and most of the others, but I got back with the prisoner."

Not the least element of permanence in this revival of religious habits comes from this long living together, through hardships and dangers, of Frenchmen who are priests and Frenchmen who, before the war, might never have spoken with a priest. This applies particularly to workmen from cities—and to the priests themselves. The French priest is usually the son of peasants or of a middle-class family of towns. In the religious orders the higher social classes are often represented, and, of course, sometimes in the parish clergy. But it has been the great difficulty of the French priest to find common language with the workmen of organized labor; and the workmen have often been made diffident or worse towards the *curé* by politics. In the army, during the war, all barriers have been broken down. All are comrades day and night together, speaking the same army *argot*, in common struggle and danger, helping each other, interested in each other's life, living, fighting, dying in one mass.

This will surely have an abiding religious effect when war is over. The Union Sacrée of Frenchmen in the trenches will not easily slump back to the ante-bellum politician's ideal of a France divided religiously against herself.

The popular rebound of such a state of things at the front on the non-combatant population is plain. It is idle to foresee what will happen after the war, but it should not be forgotten that, before the war, there were many signs of a Catholic revival. This is not shown by the writings of a few *intellectuels*, or by such recent examples as Emile Faguet asking for the sacraments on his death-bed, quite like the soldiers in the trenches, but by the attendance in Catholic churches and the willingness of young men and workmen to unite together under religious names. It is too vast and academic a subject to be treated under the head of news correspondence—*actualités*.

A word has to be said about the Pope, not of his policy during the war, which interests Frenchmen less than that of President Wilson, but of the impression he has made on French Catholics. Outsiders often identify a people's religion, which is intimate to the individual souls, with the religion's organization. Politicians have often thought to suppress the one with the other, with the effect that the religion slipped through their laws and startled them by spontaneously reorganizing. So far as the Pope is concerned, the French Protestant journal *Le Temps* thinks he was morally obliged to take sides officially. Individual French Catholics no more think so than did the German soldiers asking absolution of a French priest.

Notes from the Capital

JAMES HAMILTON LEWIS.

Had James Hamilton Lewis lived under a monarchical government, he might have held the office of King's Champion, if his recent activities as Senatorial defender of the President afford a fair criterion of his taste and talents. For some time Senator Stone had a monopoly of that occupation, and I can imagine the President welcoming the change. Stone is not the type of man who would be selected on the strength of his personality to stand sponsor for an executive officer who has given the people a pledge of pitiless publicity in the conduct of his Administration. His eyes, in which one can read nothing; his cautious gait, and his hesitant manner till he knows positively what side of any controversy he is expected to espouse, contrast sharply with the self-assured but ingratiating breeziness of Lewis, who is never at a loss to know what he thinks, or to give you reasons of some sort for holding such opinions.

When Lewis first came to Congress nearly every one was misled by his oddities into assuming that he did not amount to much. His raiment made the lilies of the field look cheap as dandelions, and dulled the most vivid memories of Berry Wall. His bronze-toned beard, suggesting by its effulgence a halo turned upside-down; his unique scarfs and waistcoats, the peculiar curl of his hat-brim, the color and cut of his other garments, his clean enunciation in speaking, and the wavy inflections of his voice, set the capital agape, and for a while consumed columns of space in the newspapers of the country. Time has tempered without changing him. He is still the glass of fashion and the mould of form, albeit the radiant aura that once enveloped him has melted away to a considerable extent.

In the era when he was most dazzling to look upon, there were persons so presumptuous as to pick him up for a dandy and nothing more. One was Speaker Reed, who used to refer to him in private conversation as "that garrulous rainbow." The simile was apt in a larger sense than as applied to the colorful front of Lewis; for in associations and experience he has come very near spanning the national horizon. He was born in Virginia, passed his youth in Georgia, migrated to Washington Territory to seek his fortune, came East as a Congressman a few years after the Territory had been admitted to Statehood, removed to Chicago soon after finishing his term in the House, and is now serving as Senator from Illinois as the choice of the Democrats at large, expressed in the primaries of 1912.

Neither President McKinley nor his Secretary of State, the present Justice Day, was deceived by Lewis's D'Orsayish appearance; they sent him as a special commissioner to Canada, to straighten out sundry tangles which had occurred in the relations between the Governments of the United States and the Dominion over customs questions on the British Columbian border, and he had already served during President Harrison's Administration as a member of the commission to compose our differences with England over the Alaska boundary. He is, moreover, author of several legal textbooks, which range in scope from a digest on elections to a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

treatise on the development of international law.

One frequently hears from strangers in Washington, after a first look at Lewis, such questions as: "What has the man to gain from his eccentricities?" They may be answered Yankee-fashion: Why did Napoleon order the gilding of the dome of the Invalides? What induced Attorney-General Brewster to wear ruffled shirt-bosoms and embroidered, flowing wristbands? Had Hannibal Hamlin any special object in appearing at all times in the swallow-tail and black habiliments usually reserved for evening dress? The Invalides dome diverted the thoughts of a restless populace, and lured it into keeping quiet a while longer. Brewster's anachronistic finery switched public attention from a physical disfigurement about which he was morbidly sensitive. Hamlin, the last important human relic of the Lincoln epoch still left in the field of active statesmanship, might have been confused with a crowd of lesser dignitaries but for his distinctive attire. The artistically softened gorgeousness of Lewis sets people talking about him, generally in unflattering terms at the start; then, when their curiosity is sufficiently whetted to lead them to study him a little, and they find out what meat lies under his frivolous-looking shell, they experience a pleasing shock of surprise, and like him better for the self-satisfaction they feel over what they ingenuously fancy is their original discovery.

Although his political conceits are as variegated as his costumes, and often challenge the faith of his best friends in their sincerity, he contrives somehow to make them count at the ballot-box. How such a royal dresser and dispenser of perfumed mannerisms manages to capture an old-fashioned Populist crowd is certainly a marvel, but quite as certainly he does it whenever he lays himself out to that end. Possibly it is by means like those he used to persuade judge after judge, in the Nordstrom murder case, to intervene just in the nick of time, till the convicted prisoner had enjoyed nine years of life between his original sentence of death and the adverse decision of the final appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. Or perhaps it is done by his ingenuity in phrase-making, for the apostles of discontent are greedy devourers of phrases. One of Lewis's which has been frequently recalled during the recent controversy over the army appropriations is his description of the "tasselated military satraps and gilded society sapheads" who are eager to see the army dominant in our civil affairs. Denis Kearney in his most luxuriant mood produced little better.

Lewis probably is governed in politics by the same principle which guided him in comparative youth while seeking a livelihood: he went where an opening seemed to invite him, and he took what he could get. When he couldn't find a job which would bring in a hundred dollars a week, he was not ashamed to accept one at fifteen dollars a month till he could improve his condition. Then he was clever enough to save money and plant his savings in real estate in quarters towards which he saw other people turning their eyes. That is why he can afford now to spend as much in making himself beautiful as some of his brother Senators spend on bed, board, and poker.

TATTLER.

The World's Highway

By MORRIS JASTROW, JR.

The present struggle in Mesopotamia dates from ante-bellum days, from the time when the projected railway across the plateau of Asia Minor through the Cilician Gates to northern Syria, and thence along the Euphrates to Bagdad and the Persian Gulf, became a disturbing factor in European politics. The rapprochement during the last decade between England and Russia, which led to the pooling of their interests in Persia, was another prelude to the struggle, since it was counterbalanced by growing German influence in Turkey. How the problem of the control of the highway from Constantinople to Bagdad will be settled, it is impossible to forecast, though we know that some understandings exist between England and Russia on the one hand, and doubtless between Germany and Turkey on the other, contingent upon the issue of the war. In the meanwhile it is of importance to understand from the larger historical point of view the significance of the campaign in the East, taking place on historic soil, with armies crossing regions that have seen several great civilizations arise and decay.

I.

It is evident that in a survey of the present situation in the East Asia Minor cannot be separated from Mesopotamia. Constantinople and Bagdad are the two poles of an electric current. It is generally assumed that the possession of Constantinople is important for Russia as affording an outlet for her through an ice-free harbor, but with the Suez Canal in England's hands and with British Gibraltar guarding the exit into the Atlantic, even the possession of Constantinople would not give Russia or any other Power a commanding maritime position. The real significance of Constantinople is not as an outlet for maritime commerce and for naval expansion, but as the starting-point for the highway on the other side of the Bosphorus which stretches across Asia Minor, through the famous Cilician Gates to Mesopotamia and the Persian Gulf—itself a further starting-point for India; and this has been, as a matter of fact, the historical significance of Constantinople at all times, back to the days when the older Byzantium was established at the narrows of the Bosphorus. Turkey's position as a world power has always been due to this position of Constantinople, and when in the year 1453 the city fell into the hands of the Ottoman Turks, it meant not only the triumph of the Crescent over the Cross, but the blockade against the Christian countries of Europe of the great road leading to Bagdad and Mesopotamia. This effectual wall raised against Christian Europe stimulated exploration towards the West in order to find a new route to the East.

The fall of Constantinople was the real reason for Columbus's discovery of America. His search for a western route to India was made imperative by the closing up of the highway across Asia Minor which had been opened up to European advance as far back as the days of Alexander the Great, in the middle of the fourth century B. C., and which for considerably more than a millennium before the clash between the Old East and what was at that time the Young West had been a battle-ground on which the armies of the great Powers of antiquity—Egypt and Assyria—had appeared in the endeavor to obtain possession of the passes and roads, and thus hold the region at bay. It was from Asia Minor that both Egypt and Mesopotamia were menaced at various periods. The rulers of the Nile and of the Euphrates Valley never felt secure against the onrush of hordes from the north. Readers of the Old Testament will recall the terms in which Hebrew prophets of the ninth and eighth centuries pictured the advance from the north as foreshadowing the doom of the ancient world. They had in mind the groups dwelling in the mountain fastnesses and in the plateaus of Asia Minor, prominent among which were the Hittites, who as early as 2000 B. C. established centres in the upper regions of the Euphrates, and somewhat later in the extreme north of Asia Minor, that eventually threatened Syria, Palestine, and Egypt on the one side, and Mesopotamia on the other.

The part taken by the Hittites in ancient history has only become known to us during the past thirty years through explorations in Asia Minor, through the discovery of remarkable Hittite rock sculptures and huge palaces and monuments in this region—notably at Carchemish, Marash, Sendschirli, Malatia, Hamath, Fraktin, Ujük, and Baghazkeui—and through the Egyptian and Babylonian-Assyrian written records of encounters with the Hittites.* Those who would know who these Hittites were and what their appearance on the horizon of history meant should read Garstang's "Land of the Hittites"† or in more succinct and suggestive form Eduard Meyer's "Reich und Kultur der Chetiter," which was published just before the outbreak of the war, and which ought to be translated for the benefit of English readers. As early as 1800 B. C. these Hittites of Asia Minor penetrated into Mesopotamia, and for a short period Hittite rulers occupied the throne of Babylon. Assyria—the northward extension of Babylonia—when it became an independent and powerful kingdom had constant encounters with some branch or other of the Hittites. It was against them that both Egyptian and

*The numerous Hittite inscriptions found in Asia Minor have not yielded their secrets. The decipherment of the strange characters, so baffling to scholars when first seen, has recently made some progress, thanks to the ingenious combinations of an English scholar, R. C. Thompson. The discovery a few years ago at Boghazkeui in northern Asia Minor of a large archive of tablets, containing Hittite records not written in the usual Hittite hieroglyphics, but in Babylonian cuneiform characters, and including also a large number of syllabaries which furnish hundreds of Hittite words with their equivalents in Babylonian, will form a further basis for the solution of the Hittite problem. A large publication on this subject by a German scholar was announced as ready for the press in 1914 and has presumably been delayed on account of the war.

†See the *Nation*, October 19, 1911.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Assyrian rulers had to contend in order to maintain their prestige. In Egyptian annals, the battle of Kadesh on the Orontes, *c.* 1300 B. C.—a Hittite centre—looms up large. The victory over the Hittites at that point, after a critical turn which threatened the life of Rameses II, was in every respect vital to Egypt, for, had the fortunes of war gone against Rameses, Egypt might have fallen into their hands. Similarly, Assyria never rested secure till at the close of the eighth century B. C. Sargon II dealt the Hittites a fatal blow at Carchemish on the Euphrates, and as we pass down the ages we find Persians, Greeks, Romans, Arabs, Selyuk, and Ottoman Turks striving for control of Asia Minor as a necessary condition to maintaining themselves in Egypt and in Mesopotamia.

II.

The great highway across Asia Minor is strewn with Greek and Roman remains as evidence of the strategic importance attached at all times to this region.* The establishment of Byzantium or Constantinople as the capital of the Eastern Empire was a recognition of the head of the Bosphorus as the entrance gate to the highway, but the Eastern Empire's failure to secure as firmly the other gate at the exit to the Persian Gulf prepared the way for her own undoing. When the Arabs in the seventh century swept over the paths marked out by ancient civilizations, their generals realized that both Bagdad and Constantinople must be in their hands in order to insure the permanency of Islamic control in the East. Since, however, at no time till the advent of the Ottoman Turks were *both* ends of the route ever securely in control of one Power, no political unity was achieved by the conquests of the Arabs and no guarantees of permanency. The Caliphates of Bagdad and of Damascus were rivals, as both were rivals of the Caliphate established in Cairo. The decay of all three was inevitable because none of them firmly controlled Asia Minor. A new era, lasting to the threshold of our own days, came with the fall of Constantinople in the year 1453. That event marked the establishment of the Ottoman Empire, the feature of which was the control by one Power of the *two gates* of the great highway—Constantinople at one end and Bagdad at the other. Having this highway, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, on the one hand, came as naturally under the sway of the Turks as did Mesopotamia on the other.

The dissolving process for the Turkish Empire, foreshadowed by serious defeats at the close of the seventeenth century, was hastened by Napoleon's Egyptian and Syrian campaigns. Had he been able to realize his ambitions, he would no doubt have carried his armies across Asia Minor to Constantinople in one direction, and from Damascus, which he succeeded in reaching, to Bagdad in the other. Egypt was finally lopped off in our days through the English occupation, and now we are witnessing the attempt to wrest both Constantinople and Bagdad out of the hands of the Turks. Constantinople carries with it Asia Minor, and the possession of Bagdad means Mesopotamia.

The proposed railway from a point opposite Constantinople across to Bagdad, thus traversing the most important as well as the most historic of all ancient routes, was on the surface a purely commercial enterprise, but in reality is to be looked upon as the greatest strategic movement of modern times. England cannot afford to have both Constantinople and Bagdad connected in this way under German influence, without signing her own death-warrant. The control of the two gates involves of necessity the mastery of the East. If the possession of Antwerp by Germany would mean, as Lord Kitchener is reported to have said, a pistol pointed at England, Bagdad under German control would be a 42-centimetre gun aimed at India. England and Germany—so it is generally believed—were close to an agreement in the summer of 1914, whereby Germany was to control the railway across Asia Minor to a point near Bagdad, with England commanding the exit to the Persian Gulf.

It was the obvious step for England immediately upon the outbreak of the war to plan for the conquest of Mesopotamia; and the plan of campaign in Asia Minor now being carried out by Russia was conceived for equally sound reasons. The English campaign has failed, at least for the present. The Russian army appears to have fared better. But it is inconceivable that, even if Russia without England's help should be victorious, England would permit her ally to retain control of this region after the war, for Russia at Bagdad would be a menace to England, in no less degree than Germany.

III.

The Mesopotamian campaign thus presents singularly intricate and interesting problems. In many respects it is the most important of the various issues involved in the war, fraught with possibilities that may indeed change the aspect of the world for the next generation. It opens up also a vision of a revival of culture and commercial prosperity in a region that once disputed with ancient Egypt the mastery of the world, and that produced a civilization of a high order which was old even before India appeared on the horizon. What England has done and is still doing for Egypt in infusing the western spirit of progress into the land of the Nile and resuscitating that historic corner of the world, she or possibly some other European Power will in all human probability do during this century for Mesopotamia. The first steps towards such a rehabilitation of the Euphrates Valley of Mesopotamia were taken some years ago by the careful study of the irrigation of the Valley undertaken by Sir William Willcocks as adviser to the Turkish Ministry of Works.* As Egypt is the gift of the Nile, so the Euphrates and Tigris are the life-veins of Mesopotamia, but the regulation of the overflow of these rivers during the prolonged rainy season which begins with October and lasts till the late spring is the essential condition for the promotion of fertility and for making the valley capable of harboring a large population. Babylonia acquired her preëminent position in antiquity solely through the elaborate canal and irrigating system connecting the two rivers at favorable points and through loops of independent canals, reinforced by dikes marked out in connection with each of the rivers.

The rulers of Babylonia devoted themselves energetically and persistently to this work of irrigation, and many of them have left records of the canals built or restored by them. Alexander the Great, when he conquered Mesopotamia, did the same. Through thus directing the overflow of the two rivers into the fields the remarkable fertility of the Euphrates Valley, which aroused the astonishment of Herodotus, was produced. There was no other district that could vie in this respect with the Euphrates Valley—not even the Valley of the Nile. Nowhere, therefore, can we follow more clearly the rise of a high order of civilization as the result of a partnership between man and nature than in ancient Mesopotamia.* The canal and irrigation system produced the wealth for which Babylon was renowned. By virtue of the fertility produced the district was capable of supporting an enormous population. Wealth and population naturally brought commerce in their wake. The grains and wares of ancient Babylonia were sent in all directions. The Tigris more particularly became one of the greatest avenues of commerce in antiquity. Civilization followed in the wake of national prosperity, and we can now trace back the high order of culture attained in the Euphrates Valley to about 3500 B. C. on the basis of records written in the curious cuneiform script. Naturally, we must go back at least another millennium for the beginnings of this culture, if not, indeed, two millenniums.

IV.

A strong impetus to convert natural conditions to man's own uses was given by the early mixture of races in the Euphrates Valley, always acting as a spur to human endeavor. A non-Semitic race known as the Sumerians makes its appearance in this region at a very remote period, coming as conquerors from a mountainous land and imposing on the Semitic settlers, known as Akkadians, its language and its script—for the conquering race had already reached a comparatively high grade of culture before entering the Euphrates Valley. It is quite within the sphere of possibility that the home of the Sumerians was in the mountainous regions of Asia Minor, and perhaps it will yet turn out that these Sumerians

*See W. M. Ramsay's valuable work, *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, for details.

*The results are embodied in his work on *The Irrigation of Mesopotamia* (London, 1911), with a large portfolio of most valuable maps and charts.

*Strictly speaking the term should include merely the land between the Euphrates and Tigris, but as conventionally used it covers the entire Euphrates Valley as well as the northern extension along both banks of the Tigris up to a point to the north of Mosul.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were an offshoot of the Hittites. For the present, however, the origin of the Sumerians, as of the Hittites, is still in dispute.* The time is not ripe for a solution of the intricate problem involved, but so much is clear, that the Sumerians were at first the superior race, and that after *c.* 2500 B. C. they were gradually replaced by the Akkadians, who adopted the Sumerian script as a somewhat clumsy medium for their Semitic speech. With Hammurapi, the great conqueror and lawgiver, *c.* 2000 B. C., the Semitic control in Mesopotamia is securely established. The Babylonian civilization, of which the Assyrian culture is merely a northern extension with some modifications, is thus a mixture of non-Semitic and Semitic elements; its strength and its endurance were due largely to this mixed character, and so durable was the culture evolved that it spread to other lands and left its traces throughout the ancient world long after the power of Babylonia and Assyria had faded.

The course of civilization runs in Mesopotamia from south to north, following the line of the two rivers, and more particularly that of the eastern river—the Tigris. The Assyrian Empire comes into prominence about 2000 B. C., and its striking feature is that its chief cities—Nineveh and Ashur—lay along the Tigris, while the older centres in the south—Ur, Erech, Nippur, Babylon, and Sippar—were on the Euphrates or on some branch issuing from it. The Euphrates is, therefore, the river *par excellence* of Babylonia, as the Tigris is the river of Assyria. The reason for the change is to be sought in the position of the Tigris as the avenue of commerce. It is a more rapid stream than the Euphrates and is navigable up to Mosul, which lies opposite the site of ancient Nineveh, whereas the Euphrates as it approaches the Persian Gulf becomes sluggish, and at present, owing to the general neglect of the country, loses itself in a vast stretch of marsh lands. This, to be sure, was obviated during the flourishing days of the Babylonian Empire by the canals and the system of irrigation, and yet even in ancient times we note the tendency, as commerce developed, of the important centres to shift towards the Tigris, or at all events to points close to the junction of the two rivers. Because of this position, Babylon—some fifty miles south of Bagdad—eventually became the capital of the Empire.

Assyria, after the middle of the second millennium, gradually obtained the mastery over Babylonia through the control of the Tigris. Indeed, this mastery was essential for Assyria, which would otherwise have lacked an exit to the sea. Babylonia bore the yoke unwillingly and, availing herself of every symptom of declining strength in Assyria, frequently rebelled and made the endeavor to renew her ancient position. Assyria, on the other hand, in order to retain control of the Euphrates Valley, was obliged to extend her sway into Asia Minor. With this in view she fixed her capital considerably further to the north at Nineveh, the extreme point to which navigation was possible on the Tigris, as a bulwark against advancing hordes from the northeast and northwest. She was thus doomed by the more northern position to frequent warfare with these hordes, to a far greater extent than her older rival Babylonia. The very existence of Assyria depended upon her becoming a first-class military Power, and she ultimately paid the penalty of all military empires by exhausting her vitality. Nineveh fell in 600 B. C., and her old rival, Babylonia, enjoyed a renaissance of her ancient glory, though only for a short period, for in 539 B. C. Cyrus, coming from the northeast and marching along the route on which, according to recent reports, a part of the Russian army is making for Bagdad, took possession of Babylon, and with that step became the master of Mesopotamia.

Persia was succeeded by Greece, and so long as the Greeks retained control, the ancient civilization of the region maintained itself, though modified by Persian and Greek influences. The march of Roman Imperialism led to a general domination of the East, but the force of the march was spent by the time Roman rule reached the Euphrates. Strong as the impress of that rule was throughout Asia Minor, stretching across the old highway to Byzantium and extending southward into Syria through Palestine into the mountain roads of Arabia, the Romans did little to transform Mesopotamia, and did not even stay the process of gradual decay which had begun to set in and which was arrested merely to a certain degree during the four centuries of Sassanian rule (*c.* 225-650 B. C.) Owing to changes in the course of the two rivers, the capital of the region shifted from Babylon on the Euphrates to a position farther north, but again at the point of strategic significance where the Euphrates and Tigris came closest. Ctesiphon was founded by the Sassanian rulers, and Ctesiphon in turn yielded to the neighboring Bagdad upon the conquest of the region by the Arabs.

The neglect of the network of canals under Persian and Sassanian rule brought about the destruction of the cities of antiquity, which became huge shapeless mounds beneath which modern explorers during the last sixty years have found the precious remains and records of Babylonian and Assyrian civilization. Without a constant control of an elaborate irrigation system, the Euphrates Valley returns to its original chaotic state. Great swamps were thus formed reaching the present area of fifty miles in width and more than two hundred miles in length. This swampy district, stretching to Basrah, and superinducing the submersion of great sections throughout the Valley during the rainy season, was one of the factors in bringing about the failure of the English campaign, since it prevented the reinforcements sent to aid Gen. Townshend from reaching him in time.

Concomitant with the neglect of irrigation, the direction of both the Euphrates and Tigris underwent changes, seeking new channels as they approached the Persian Gulf. The Tigris being a swifter stream always managed to reach the gulf, whereas the Euphrates became lost in the great swamps. The difficulties thus presented by nature in this region against man's endeavors to maintain the civilization reared by his efforts are further increased by the silt deposits brought down by the rivers, which lead to constant additions to the soil, so that places which in ancient times lay on the Persian Gulf are now some ninety miles away. When Bagdad was founded by the Arabs, Basrah, some 300 miles south, was selected as its port as lying close to the Persian Gulf, but the increase of soil necessitated in time a second port at Fao, some fifty miles further south.

V.

With the founding of Bagdad by the Abbassid caliphs in the middle of the eighth century B. C. as the capital of Mesopotamia, a genuine renaissance set in. The overflow of the two rivers was once more regulated by an elaborate canal system, dikes and dams were built, and the irrigation of the Valley was carefully and thoroughly carried out. The position of Bagdad on the Tigris, but at a point near the junction with the Euphrates and connected with the latter by a canal, is again significant of the changes that had set in during the centuries intervening between the decline of the old civilization and the rise of the new one. For the Arabs, access to the Persian Gulf and a control of the route leading from Asia Minor to that great body of water was the all-important issue. Once more southern Mesopotamia became the centre of the region. Bagdad took the place of ancient Babylon, while the new city Mosul to the north, replacing Nineveh, became of secondary importance. The result, however, was that the Caliphate of Bagdad, despite its splendor, never rose to the point of military strength once occupied by Assyria. The Arabic Empire of Mesopotamia followed rather along the lines of ancient Babylonia. Science and art and literature flourished, but the Caliphate spent itself in vain endeavors to control the highway of Asia Minor. The goal of both Abbasside Caliphs at Bagdad, as that of the Omayyad Dynasty at Damascus, was always Constantinople—a replica, therefore, of conditions in the previous three millenniums, when Babylonians and Assyrians strove with the Hittites. Rome failing to hold the outlet at the Persian Gulf, the loss of control of Asia Minor was merely a question of time. Constantinople at one end was a constant object of attack, and without a strong series of garrisons across Asia Minor up to Bagdad—precisely along the route selected for the Bagdad railway—the Byzantine Empire could not endure.

On the other hand, had the Abbasside and Omayyad Caliphates united their forces instead of becoming rivals, a great Islamic empire with two capitals—one at Constan-

*It is not necessary to assume that the Hittites were a homogeneous group; indeed, it is more likely that the term embraces a number of distinct ethnic units, representing successive waves of migration into Asia Minor from various quarters.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tinople and the other at Bagdad—might have maintained itself against the Selyuk Turks who overran Asia Minor at the close of the eleventh century. The Crusades represent another and a final attempt for European control of the East, and though ostensibly undertaken for the purpose of wresting the sites sacred to Christianity from Moslem hands, it is significant that the real battlefields were on the plateaus and passes of Asia Minor. This was inevitable, for Jerusalem could not be held without Damascus nor Damascus without the roads leading to the Cilician Gates. The real goal of the Crusaders, as of the Abbasside and Omayyad Caliphs, was against Constantinople—inevitably so; and for a short period Constantinople was actually held. Finally, in the fifteenth century came the Ottoman Turks, and succeeded in accomplishing what Babylonia and Assyria never fully carried out, and what the Arabs also failed to accomplish—a control from Constantinople to Bagdad, and with that a complete mastery of the East.

What we are witnessing to-day in the East is, therefore, the renewal of a struggle of vast historic moment. It is a renewal, only on a far larger scale, of the first clash between Occident and Orient in the days of Alexander the Great—an endeavor to open up again the historic highway which was closed to European control with the fall of Constantinople. As in the Middle Ages, Cross and Crescent are striving for supremacy in the East, though the symbols have changed their meaning, and the Cross has become synonymous with the modern Occidental spirit of economic and commercial progress seeking new outlet and pushing aside ruthlessly and mercilessly the conservatism of the incrustated Orient.

Correspondence

THE FRENCH ANSWER TO AN AMERICAN MESSAGE.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Your readers will, I feel confident, be interested in the accompanying French answer just received to the "Address to the Peoples of the Allied Nations," which was issued some time ago and was signed by five hundred prominent Americans from all parts of the country, expressing the strong American sympathy with the cause of the Allies. The French reply is signed by five hundred of the most prominent Frenchmen. It ought, it seems to me, to quicken the American desire to give the strongest moral support to the great cause for which France and her allies are struggling, and which, as they rightly regard it, is—broadly considered—the cause of America also. I hardly think that Americans as a rule realize the extent to which, in its highest interests, this country is vitally concerned in the issue of the great conflict.

Among the five hundred signers of the French rejoinder are prominent statesmen, former Cabinet officers, judges of the higher courts, lawyers, clergymen of different denominations (including eight prominent Jewish rabbis), men of letters, artists, musicians, professors and college presidents, physicians, mayors of cities and other municipal officials, presidents of chambers of commerce and other prominent citizens. The signers, in other words, are men of similar position and prominence to those who signed the American address. Among the signers are such distinguished men as the former Cabinet officers Clemenceau, Millerand, and Yves-Guyot; among the clergy the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris and the Cardinal Archbishop of Montpellier; among the lawyers men like Maître Labori, of Dreyfus fame; among the artists such men as the sculptor Rodin and the painter Dagnan-Bouveret; of the musicians Saint-Saëns, Debussy; among the writers such men as Rostand, Pierre Loti, Camille Flammarion, Anatole le Braz, Joseph Bédier, Salomon Reinach, Paul Sabatier. It is a distinguished list.

This French manifesto should recall to us the nation's debt to Lafayette and Rochambeau and de Grasse.

One of the Signers of the American Address.

Cambridge, Mass., August 9.

THE LETTER.

We, the undersigned, to the number of five hundred, citizens of the French Republic, extend our thanks to the five hundred citizens of the Republic of the United States of America for the noble message which they have addressed to the Allied peoples.

We take note with joy of this loyal collective declaration; of your ardent sympathy with our cause; of your reprobation of the methods of our adversaries in the conduct of the war.

We take note that in your judgment—the judgment of free citizens of a free country, having freely deliberated—you believe the American conscience ought not to be silent in the face of events which are of vital concern to the evolution of civilization and to internationai morality; and that this judgment has only been reached by you, representatives of the best of America, after a cool and thoughtful consideration of German documents.

We take note that in your eyes the invasion of Belgium is an unjustifiable crime, and that all the outrages against civilization which preceded or followed it break international laws, the sacredness of treaties, the rights of small nations.

We take note that in your opinion a peace which should not reëstablish Belgium in its prosperous independence; which should not liberate all the small and oppressed nationalities (and among these we include our loyal Alsace-Lorraine); which should not bring about the suppression of militarism, by which we understand that German militarism which is at this moment seeking to crush civilization; which in a word should not end in a victory for the ideals of the Allies, would be a disaster for civilization, that is to say, also for America, the highest expression of whose civilization you represent.

We thank you with all our hearts for having thus stated in the name of the universal conscience that we are struggling for right, justice, liberty, and for the preservation of the ideals of humanity from a scientific barbarism.

We thank you for supporting us thus firmly, loyally, and spontaneously, without hesitation, with all the earnestness of your hearts and without reservation.

Not long ago France offered to the United States of America a colossal Statue of Liberty. You placed it in New York at the entry of your greatest port, as a symbol of your history and your institutions.

A replica of this statue has been placed in Paris on the Seine in order to recall to the people of France all that our history and our institutions have in common with yours. Your message proves that our two nations have still the same ideal, and that to-day, as in the past, they are marching in the same way and that the bonds which have already united them have been drawn still closer.

In the name of all the French who have died for that ideal which is yours; in the name of all the French who suffer, unshakable, in order to save that ideal which is yours, the five hundred Frenchmen whose names follow have signed.

MR. LONDON'S FORECAST OF SIEGE WARFARE.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In the very interesting comments on the war, on page 99 of the *Nation* for August 3, I notice the statement, "The amazing development of trench warfare was not foreseen."

Permit me to point out that the developments of trench warfare were foreseen by Mr. Jack London, in an article written by him for the *Overland Monthly*, March, 1900. He said: "Soldiers will be compelled to creep forward, burying themselves in the earth like moles." And again: "Future wars must be long. No more open fields; no more decisive victories; but a *succession of sieges* fought over and through *successive lines of widely extending fortifications*. The defeated army—supposing that it can be defeated—will retire slowly, intrenching itself step by step, and most likely with steam intrenching machines."

You further say: "Nor did even the Germans understand in advance the rôle artillery and high explosives would play." London said (1900): "The artillery has come to be greatly relied upon. Competent military experts hold that the French artillery has increased in deadliness in the last thirty years one hundred and sixteen times. This has been made possible by the use of range-finders, chemical instead of mechanical mixtures of powder, high explosives, increase of range, and rapid fire."

While Mr. London's main contention, the impossibility of war, has been refuted, it is extremely interesting to re-read his essay in the light of the fulfilment of some of his predictions.

Roger Sprague.

Berkeley, Cal., August 9.

SUPPORTING THE PRESIDENT.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: As an independent, I hope that you will finally see your way to support President Wilson for reëlection. My wish in this matter, I am vain enough to think, is not due to partisanship or to prejudice against his opponent, for I am keenly aware of the merits of Mr. Hughes. Both are men of independent character, high mental calibre, and unquestionable integrity. In these respects they are essentially alike. To say that one is more patriotic than the other is rank nonsense.

But the logic of the situation, however, it seems to me, is largely on the side of Mr.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Wilson. His record of performance looms large when compared with that of his immediate predecessors. The Rural Credits measure was discussed during Taft's Administration, but that is as far as it got. Whether the Republicans were afraid of the Plutocrats or not cannot be definitely determined, but this is the reason usually assigned by their political enemies. The panic of 1907 was prima facie evidence that our banking system was rotten, yet nothing was done. The Federal Reserve act is Wilson's answer to Republican delinquency in this matter. The Tariff Commission was also a subject of much comment under Taft's Administration, but with the usual Taft result. Now Wilson gets the credit for putting the bill through. Mr. Taft in his pre-election speeches promised an equitable downward revision of the tariff which a great majority of the people, irrespective of party, desired. Most Americans know the result, "the best Tariff bill" ever enacted. Taft even vetoed the bill which was to pull the teeth of the obnoxious woollen schedule K. The Underwood tariff, no doubt, has many defects, but the recent action of the President shows a disposition to handle the question scientifically.

President Wilson gave currency to the phrase "forward looking," and this will continue to be his motto while he is our Chief Executive. His general policy bears the earmarks of genuine statesmanship. He is looking forward to the time when the United States will be the greatest nation on earth, financially, commercially, industrially, and morally. He recognizes this as our birthright, and while he has this ideal of what we ought to be, he has not been remiss in leading and directing both by legislation and by counsel. He is endeavoring to break up our policy of isolation so that we may take our rightful place as the leader of the nations. Scaling down of the tariff wall was the first step along this line. The Panama Tolls act another, for are we not part and parcel of a world of people? His Mexican policy is only a phase of this general programme. To show justice to the Mexicans, to discourage their custom of obtaining power by assassination, to help them compose their difficulties, and in the end to have their good will and that of all Latin America has been the President's aim.

Mr. Hughes's platitude of "incertitude" hurled at Wilson immediately after his resignation does not clear the atmosphere any. Criticism of this kind is always easy and cheap. If it was said for political effect, then its author is to that extent a demagogue; but let that be as it may, what the independent voter would like to know (and it is up to Mr. Hughes, since he made the criticism) is just what he would have done had he been President. If he says that he would have promptly recognized Huerta, then we shall have something upon which to base a conclusion. We know then that he would have been willing to sacrifice our high ideal of justice to the degree that such action would have placed our approval upon the method by which Huerta obtained his power. This is not asking too much of Mr. Hughes, for has he not the advantage of hindsight? Would he restore the ultra protectionist schedules of the Aldrich Tariff bill, or emasculate the Federal Reserve, the Rural Credits, and Tariff Commission acts by amendments? These may sound like simple questions, but the voter is entitled to know in just what ways he proposes to improve upon the policy of President Wilson. Certainties are as a rule preferable to uncertainties. The criticism can hold, if at all, with respect to his German submarine and Mexican policies, for in all other respects Wilson's action is without parallel in American history. But in both of these cases he has displayed remarkable tact and caution, and has won a notable victory in one case and will do so in the other if it is humanly possible under the circumstances to do so. Wilson's versatility, subtleness, and persistent and insistent patience are elemental characteristics that stamp him as preëminently fit to handle problems of this kind. The cold, uncompromising directness and judicial brusqueness of Justice Hughes are not generally regarded as necessary prerequisites to successful diplomacy.

If Mr. Hughes should attack Wilson's naval policy, he will be reminded of the overt act of von Diederich in Manila Bay, our traditional policy of avoiding "entangling alliances," and the recent feat of the Deutschland.

The money power is opposing Wilson on account of the income tax, the Federal Reserve act, Rural Credits law, the Underwood tariff, etc., not because these laws are unconstitutional, but because they curtail special privilege and give relief to the many. These questions naturally arise: How would Hughes's election be regarded by the Kaiser and the Allies? Would the submarine question have to be settled anew? And does Hughes know more about the complexities of the Mexican problem than the man who has wrestled with it for more than three years?

D. M. Deeg.

Goshen, Wash., August 5.

DO REPRESENTATIVES REPRESENT?

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Your article in the *Nation* of August 10 with the above heading is very suggestive. The old Athenian method of choosing an Assembly by lot was hardly so foolish as what we do now! The trouble, as you say, is not that we have no good men available for public service. Neither is it because the public salaries are insufficient. But the men whom we need cannot serve us on the terms that we generally force upon them. There are men in almost every community who have no selfish wish for office. They will not beg for votes or pull wires for themselves. They will make no pretence of party loyalty which they do not feel. They cannot work up a fictitious enthusiasm over the platforms of either party, or find material for boasting in the conduct of their party associates. Men who tell the truth, and stand for principles, must always be unwelcome to a party machine. Putting humanity first, they cannot join in the cry, "America first!" They know too well how the dangers of aggressiveness, militarism, and arrogance, such as have befallen Germans and other Imperialists, are the dangers of every nation that goes heavily armed, and meddles with other people's affairs. Being themselves straightforward in conduct, they are irked by the paltriness, crookedness, and wastefulness of legislative practice, where each party seeks to "put the other in a hole," where the stupidity of "Senatorial courtesy" thwarts public business, where the politician always has an eye for his own reëlection rather than for the public good.

Is it not most unfortunate that the rigidity of our American scheme of governmental machinery adds serious further difficulties in the way of using our best men in the service of the Democracy? There are enough voters in my own State, and in most of the States, who not only would like to send a real and high-minded representative to Congress at every election, but could and would do this, if we were not compelled to limit our choice to the district in which we happen to live, and to one of the men whom the bi-party system forces upon our choice. We are often now as badly off as if we were disfranchised. The bi-party system in this year of great and real issues over national policy and gigantic preparedness for war is so manipulated on both sides as to confuse the eyes of the voters, and to give them nothing of special importance on which to express a sincere opinion. The entire delegations of certain States are to-day supporting legislation most offensive to minorities considerable enough, if they had their due weight in Congress, to raise powerful opposition and at least obtain adequate deliberation. Could we have a more striking proof that, of all pieces of improved electoral machinery, Proportional Representation offers above everything else a means of justice to all classes of voters, as well as a practical opportunity for the public use of our reserve forces of men of courage, principle, and noblest kind of patriotism? The readers of the life of that wise and splendid Englishman, Sir John Lubbock, will recall that one of the chief efforts of his political life, entirely devoted to disinterested objects, was to procure Proportional Representation for England. But the fact that Sir John Lubbock held for many years a secure seat in Parliament, any constituency in the kingdom being free to choose him, shows how much better the British system is even now than that which holds American voters in bondage. Would there be the slightest chance of any American of Lubbock's character and independence being sent to Congress to-day? Charles F. Dole.

Southwest Harbor, Me., August 18.

HISTORY REPEATING ITSELF.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: It is an old saying that history repeats itself. In 1801, when Great Britain, as now, was allied with part of continental Europe against a great military system in the other part, Thomas Campbell, the Scotch poet, wrote home from Germany to his friends in England: "What are these neutrals but a few Americans which, by the nature of the contest at sea, must be continually arrested by either party?" (Beattie's "Life and Letters of Thomas Campbell," I, 293). For another ominous parallel let readers examine the report of the Bryce Commission on German atrocities in Belgium, and then turn to B. R. Haydon's "Autobiography and Journals," II, 250: "Monsieur d'Embden, an old officer of the Chasseurs de la Garde, dined with me, and in moments of expansion, by a good fire, and over a glass of wine, described the deeds of vice, violence, and iniquity which the soldiers of Napoleon had done all over Europe. . . . Wherever the army came convents were opened," etc. I hesitate to quote the rest of the page. There is nothing new under the sun, not even in the horrors perpetrated for a place in the sun.

Frederick E. Pierce.

South Britain, Conn., August 18.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Literature

JAPANESE IMPERIAL EXPANSION.

Japanese Expansion and American Policies. By James Francis Abbott. New York: The Macmillan Co. $1.50.

In dealing with the question of Japanese Imperial expansion it is imperative for us to know whether the Japanese people are essentially one, with no race division or social cleavage. Professor Abbott differs with all the best authorities in supposing two alien races in Japan, one of which came "by way of the South, originating doubtless from India, and hence of Aryan origin," and goes on to say that "inherent racial prejudice has prevented intermarriage between this superior race and the inferior Mongolian element, which outnumbers the other, twenty to one, and constitute(s) the *heimin* or common people. The southern element is the ruling caste and has been for centuries. Its members are known as *shizoku* (*samurai*) or gentry." While it is true that certain ambitious native scholars, eager to place their race on a non-Mongolian basis, have postulated the arrival of Aryan immigrants in Japan by way of the south, yet their contention remains speculative and visionary. As far back as history can take us, the heart of the Japanese people was at Yamato in the main island; the Japanese were a united people, driving the aboriginal Ainu north to the straits of Tsugaru; and the *samurai* were naturally evolved from the common herd by qualities of loyalty, moral initiative, and martial prowess. They were and are nothing more than the cream of the people, who naturally marry in their own class, as happens everywhere. There is more "race solidarity" in Japan than in France, by the author's own admission in a later chapter (page 180). The nation is a unit, barring the Ainu savages, who are much more than a "few hundred," as the author states (page 13). In Hokkaidō there are to-day probably 15,000 Ainus, and their number is not decreasing; although relatively, owing to the colonization of the island, they grow feebler.

Professor Abbott, by the way, is careful to mark the long ō in Hokkaidō; but why does he give us such monstrosities as "Kyōtō" (Kyōto), "Tokyo" (Tōkyō), "Chōshu" (Chōshū), all on one page (14)? On this same page he also tells us that "the daimyō owed allegiance to the Shōgun alone"; which was not the case, for the Shōgun was only a *primus inter pares* at best, and a mere regent at that. To repeat the blunder and term him a "monarch," as he does at page 22, is unpardonable. But the author's history is untrustworthy throughout. On page 40, after mentioning the attempted assassination of Count Okuma, when his leg was blown off, because of public indignation aroused at the refusal of treaty revision, he goes on to say: "The reaction from these disappointments was keen and took the form of an anti-foreign sentiment expressed not so much against foreigners themselves as against foreign ideas, dress, usages, etc.; and the superiority of native institutions began to be preached. The Government, however, went on with its reforms, and in 1889 the Emperor promulgated the Constitution, organizing a Diet and a machinery of government modelled after that of Prussia."

But Okuma's attempted assassination occurred in October, 1889, many months after the promulgation of the Constitution; and the three or four years previous to this event were marked, not by reaction against foreign ways, but by a popular craze in the opposite direction. Insults to foreigners, especially to foreign women, began to be common in the capital after 1890, the reaction taking this unpleasant form.

The author's Philippine history requires a thorough revision. "The islands," he tells us, "were discovered by Magellan in 1521. In 1564 one Miguil [Miguel] de Legazpi was sent to be Governor of the Philippines for life. He proceeded forthwith not only to pacify, but to Christianize, the people, and met with extraordinary success, except among those tribes that had already embraced Mohammedanism or were too remote to reach. So thoroughly Christianized did the northern peoples become that in 1677 the Filipinos themselves sent out missionaries to Siam, China, and Japan, to convert the heathen in those lands." But the Japanese were little amenable to this process, and tortured and killed the missionaries. The Filipinos thereupon canonized the martyrs and enshrined their memories in popular history. Their attitude towards non-Catholics being precisely that of the Spanish or the inhabitants of Latin America, it has resulted that the Japanese are held in popular estimation, even now, to be little better than barbarians, an opinion, graciously adds the author, "that is not shared at all by the better informed and more open-minded people of North America and northern Europe."

Now, Miguel de Legazpi was not "sent out to be Governor of the Philippines," for the islands had still to be conquered, and Manila was not founded by him until 1571. What Filipino priest ever visited Japan as a missionary at the close of the seventeenth century? In the condition of both archipelagoes at the time, was such an event likely or remotely possible? These statements are used as a basis for the argument that the conquest of the Philippines by Japan, or their transfer to that Power, would be bitterly opposed by the Filipino, who, although a Malay, in his racial sympathies is against the Oriental and with the European (p. 86).

With the author's general remarks on the whole question of a Japanese occupation of the island, there is less fault to be found. He does not see where the profit would come in. "The Philippines cannot be colonized by Japanese laborers any more than by Europeans. Any product that Japan might need would of necessity be produced by Filipino labor. . . . Above all, little development of the Philippines can take place, even under the most favorable conditions, without the investment of foreign capital. Pending such a development, the islands would be a useless burden to Japan, and the necessary capital she could never furnish herself. Altogether no greater calamity could befall the Japanese Empire than to be compelled to assume control over the Philippine Islands, so rich in potential wealth and so poor in convertible assets."

Then there is the social difficulty. The Japanese "would discover that he was a heathen in the midst of millions of Roman Catholics, whose attitude towards him would be colored not only by the feeling of the conquered towards the conqueror, but also by the aversion due to religious prejudice. So far as the Japanese has had a chance to deport himself as an overlord in Manchuria and Korea, the prospect is not reassuring. The Japanese suffers from a lack of that sort of sentiment, conspicuous in the Anglo-Saxon, that inclines the latter to assume a fatherly attitude towards an alien or inferior. His methods as a colonizer are rather more like the German—highly efficient, but not wholly sympathetic."

Once and again the author uses this term "Anglo-Saxon" to signify a type of civilization common to the British Empire and the United States, and recognized by the Japanese as Anglo-American. And yet all throughout there is a persistent unfairness to the other partner, and a constant classifying of Great Britain among the predatory European nations "who for many years have attempted to sap their way into the territory of China, dismember that country, and distribute the pieces among themselves." He fails to mention that the basis of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, so far as it concerns China, is the guarding of her territory from dismemberment. If China is to be dismembered by one or other of the two, it is Japan and not Britain who will be the guilty party. Of course, he mentions the fact that when Germany took possession of Kiao-chau, and Russia of Port Arthur, "England claimed equal privileges in Wei-hai-wei." But he does not state that Wei-hai-wei was never fortified, and that it was only held in the interests of Chinese territorial integrity. When this seemed to be secured by the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, Wei-hai-wei was returned to China. Here is the misleading way in which Professor Abbott puts this consistent act: "For the time being her hands [*i. e.*, Britain's, a "dangerous rival to Japan"] are tied, and the recent retrocession of Wei-hai-wei to China eliminates her from participation in the dismemberment of that unhappy country" (p. 227). But British policy is so at one with American in all that concerns the "Open Door" in China that if there should be a break between Japan and the United States, Great Britain has specially reserved for herself freedom of action, notwithstanding the Anglo-Japanese Alliance. In 1895, when the fruits of her victory over China were

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wrested from Japan by the joint action of Russia, Germany, and France, this "temporary and artificial union," remarks a competent authority, would have been speedily dissolved by prompt and united action on the part of Great Britain and the United States, which was not forthcoming.

In his chapter on "The Monroe Doctrine East and West," the author reveals a strange lack of acquaintance with its history and evolution. He asserts that the Doctrine "has been in the past an unacceptable thesis to the states of Europe. But in 1903 Great Britain accepted it unreservedly." Now, he ought to know that, acting no doubt in the main according to his own theory of enlightened selfishness, Great Britain declined in 1822 to be represented at the conference in Verona which met to devise a plan for aiding Spain to recover her lost colonies in South America. While the growth of republicanism seemed a menace to the Holy Alliance, to Great Britain as to the United States it meant economic gain, for the new republics were better markets for British and American than the close old colonies. It was the British Minister, George Canning—whose mantle fell later on W. E. Gladstone—who suggested that the United States should be asked to join in a joint declaration against the proposed action; and without waiting for President Monroe's decision, Great Britain made her protest to France. As a recent writer puts it, the passage of Monroe's message referring to the proposed action of the Holy Alliance, a passage which has given us the Monroe Doctrine, "was primarily designed to protect American trade rather than South American republics, in the political forms of which neither the United States nor, of necessity, Great Britain, the latter so active in encouraging our action, were deeply interested at the time." Without the British navy, indeed, to give it sanction, the Monroe Doctrine might have been so much verbiage; a view which, with odd inconsistency, Professor Abbott accepts at page 238, when he concedes that it has been the menace of England rather than our own prowess that has deterred the Continental Powers from interfering in South America. Here he practically admits what he elsewhere persistently disputes, that the foreign policies of Great Britain and the United States are in substantial agreement, so far as the treatment of weaker nations is concerned.

His handling of the Chinese-Japanese situation, inasmuch as it fails to deal with the recent extraordinary demands made upon the young republic since the capture of Kiao-chau, is out of date and ineffective. He has not a word to say of the excellent work done in China by our missionaries, teachers, Young Men's Christian Associations, and other organizations. All are unanimous in their condemnation of these exacting and humiliating demands. The time has surely gone for good when "our policy in China should be one of active coöperation with Japan, an alliance, if you will," as the author blandly suggests at page 259. He thinks that the problem to-day "reduces to the question of whether it would be to our advantage or contrariwise that China should be the scene of the pulling and hauling diplomacy so conspicuously the feature of the past two decades' history, or whether we should profit most by the elimination of the European Powers (Russia, England, Germany, and France) from political control of Chinese territory and interference in Chinese politics." The chief menace to-day to the integrity of China comes from her island neighbor, who is interfering dangerously in Chinese politics, evidently with a view to control the resources of China. The Prussianizing of Japanese political methods, which, as the author admits in a passage quoted earlier in this review, began systematically thirty years ago, has not brought these methods closer to Anglo-American ideals. If Japan "wishes the equivalent of a Monroe Doctrine for the East"—to quote the author's often dubious English—it is by no means likely to have an acceptable American flavor.

CURRENT FICTION.

A Raw Youth: A Novel in Three Parts by Fyodor Dostoevsky. From the Russian, by Constance Garnet. New York: The Macmillan Co.

This book (the seventh in the English version of Dostoievsky which is being issued by the Macmillans) presents Russian realism at its most tedious. A little balm is afforded (it is badly needed) by the author's apology on the last of its five hundred and sixty pages. It is embodied in a letter to the Raw Youth from the redoubtable Tatyana Pavlovna, after she has read his narrative:

"I must say I should like to be a novelist whose hero comes of an exceptional family. To describe him is an ungrateful task and can have no beauty of form. Moreover, these types are in any case transitory, and so a novel about them cannot have artistic finish. One may make serious mistakes, exaggerations, misjudgments. In any case, one would have to guess too much. But what is the writer to do who doesn't want to confine himself to the historical form and is possessed by a longing for the present? To guess . . . and make mistakes.

"But such an autobiography as yours might serve as material for a future work of art, for a future picture of a lawless epoch already passed. Oh, when the angry strife of the day has passed, and the future has come, then a future artist will discover beautiful forms for depicting past lawlessness and chaos. Then such autobiographies as yours—so long as they are sincere—will be of use and provide material in spite of their chaotic and fortuitous character . . . they will preserve at any rate some faithful traits by which one may guess what may have lain hidden in the heart of some raw youth of that troubled time—a knowledge not altogether valueless since from raw youths are made up the generations."

Whatever historical or documentary importance the narrative may possess must depend upon the reader's own patience and ingenuity. The youth who here records his rawness is of "an exceptional family" in the sense that he is an illegitimate son of a Russian gentleman, Versilov, by the young wife of a family serf, Dolgoruky. Through the complaisance of the Dolgoruky, the boy takes his name, and the wife becomes openly and permanently the mistress of Versilov. Versilov is the familiar figure of sensibility and charm, minus what the Western world recognizes as character, who is so dominantly the hero of Russian fiction. Spontaneous kindliness and pitiless selfishness are always at war in him. He is a sort of splendid child, good-humored, eager, and utterly without consistency or responsibility. The son, in default of a character which he could not well inherit, is endowed with an immense and defiant egotism. His perverse pride urges him to proclaim the ignominy of his birth on every occasion, and his determination to assert himself in spite of it. He has no inkling of a humane or magnanimous view of life, his purpose is merely to win a spectacular success—himself against the world. He here records, immediately after the fact, the experiences of his twenty-first year—experiences altogether haphazard and indeterminate, and set forth without selection or apportionment of detail. Out of the long rigmarole there does somehow emerge a vivid sense of the bodily and temperamental presences of a considerable number of persons. Nightmare is once more the word which suggests itself, however, in connection with this vividness. The higher realism of character in action is almost totally lacking, so far as the male figures, at least, are concerned. Sofia Andreyevna, the hapless mother who is also a hapless mistress, with her piteous devotion, and Tatyana Pavlovna, with her robust common-sense—these, to be sure, give one something to tie to. Otherwise we might put the book down wondering (as we may have wondered even in closing "The Brothers Karamazov") whether the author does not really believe character itself to be the great hallucination.

Bridge of Desire. By Warwick Deeping. New York: Robert M. McBride & Co.

A brilliant historical romancer here shifts his ground to anti-Victorian fiction, with its pound of protest and its ounce of "realism." He owns the formula: his protest and his realism alike have to do with sex. Away with cant, the patter of respectability—let us face the facts, gentlemen, and see where we really are. Marriage, now—convention holds up an ideal of single-hearted devotion, of tireless passion. Nature has no such simple notion of human mating. Let us grant that there is such a thing as a permanent union between persons of the opposite sexes. Nine times out of ten it will be a union painfully wrought out of temporary differences and estrangements and (here is the point of our present tale) infidelities. Our brilliant young playwright, seven years married to a too perfect wife, needs, the argument runs, a more varied sexual experience

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in order to convince him permanently of his happiness. Therefore, let us throw him into the hands of a widow of brazen charms and advanced morals, and let her help him thresh it out. And, to make the point less possibly unintelligible, let us have our gentleman comport himself in the most outrageous way, insult his spouse in the act of deserting her, and realize all his own ideals of a cad and a bounder; and let the wife, a new Griselda, put a good front on matters, conceal her husband's perfidy from the world, and count quietly upon his eventual return to her. But let us, in the name of common-sense, refrain from looking down upon our brother in his frailty. It is, after all, a frailty hardly to be distinguished from strength: "Superfluous vitality—that was part of his trouble; one of those periods of rejuvenescence that trick even the strong man once or twice in his career. He becomes the boy again; it is his fate to teach himself that the apples beyond the wall are not sweeter than those he can pick in his own garden. Nine times out of ten he has to learn that the forbidden fruit will set his teeth on edge." Nine times out of ten! —here we venture to differ with the energetic author. We may cheerfully agree that our playwright's experience is a common one, but why make it out universal? In such fashion our anti-Victorian protestants, like all partisans, weaken their (save the mark!) very respectable case.

MEXICO AND THE UNITED STATES.

The Early Diplomatic Relations Between the United States and Mexico. By William R. Manning. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. $2.25.

Professor Manning's volume is the most recent of the books based on the Albert Shaw Lectures on Diplomatic History. He restricts his treatment to our first formal Ministry to Mexico, and this lies almost wholly within the Administration of the second Adams. Thus he follows, with very brief mention, the era of the filibuster and revolutionary agent and precedes the period, under Jackson and his successors, when mutual suspicion and contempt were driving both nations into open hostility. He affords, therefore, some additional light upon the more remote causes of this hostility.

In his opening chapters the author explains how petty domestic politics delayed the appointment of our first Minister to Mexico. At the same time the swift changes from colonial dependency to empire and to a federal republic prevented the reception of a Mexican envoy by the United States. Thus our country failed to maintain the advantage afforded by proximity and by early recognition of Mexican independence. When our representative, Poinsett, finally reached Mexico, he found British influence paramount there. He devoted himself with indifferent success to the task of undermining it, and, with no success at all, to the completion of a favorable commercial treaty. At the same time he had to play his part in saving Cuba to Spain. This meant a check to the aspirations of Mexico and Colombia and involved far-reaching efforts to thwart English and French intrigues centring in the island. His mission thus afforded an interesting aftermath to the Monroe Doctrine.

Nor were frontier issues lacking. Inheriting from Spain her jealousy of the northern republic, the Mexican statesmen found much to feed it in proposals relating to the Santa Fé Trail, the Texas boundary, and numerous commercial disputes. In the midst of a harassing correspondence over these points, Poinsett found no chance to regain the initial advantage his country had lost. His own course, though dictated by honest purpose and wide experience in Spanish America, was not wholly free from the charge of intermeddling in local politics. He had the chance that no succeeding diplomat enjoyed, before the days of Diaz, of pushing his measures during a time of comparative peace; but the influences working against him were altogether too powerful. He was forced to leave Mexico without setting in a proper light his country's real friendship for that Power. Under the conditions confronting him it is doubtful if another could have done better.

Professor Manning presents these facts clearly, but without special distinction of narrative. His personal descriptions might occasionally be amplified to advantage. He relies almost wholly upon manuscript sources, largely those of the two capitals, but he makes brief mention of Poinsett's Papers. His footnotes contain profuse references to the best secondary sources, upon which the reader must largely depend for his background. A discriminating bibliography and a serviceable index complete this helpful study.

PRESIDENT BUTLER'S VIEWS ON EDUCATION.

The Meaning of Education: Contributions to a Philosophy of Education. By Nicholas Murray Butler. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $1.50 net.

This volume bears the same title as one by President Butler published in 1898; but nearly all except the title, and the title-essay, which constituted an address before the Liberal Club of Buffalo in 1896, is changed. Two of the old chapters are omitted, and fourteen new ones substituted, greatly increasing the bulk of the book. The titles of the new chapters summarize the topics with which educational thought has been busy for the last two decades. Among them appear Training for Vocation and Avocation, Standards, Waste in Education, The Conduct of the Kindergarten, Religious Instruction and Its Relation to Education, The Scope and Function of Secondary Education, The American College and the American University, and Discipline and the Social Aim of Education. Dr. Butler's voice has been one of the most conservatively ripe on a large number of much-debated educational issues. In this particular volume, practicality, a concern with concrete questions, is not often visible; the issues are sometimes approached on a philosophical, and very often on a highly generalized, plane. But it must be read in recognition of the fact that Dr. Butler is one of the few university presidents who believe implicitly that teachers in colleges and universities should give conscientious study to education itself, as distinct from the department of knowledge in which their direct work lies, if their teaching or administrative work is ever to bear full fruit.

The collection is best regarded as one of hortatory essays, as representing the public preaching carried on during twenty years by an influential educator. To say that this preaching is conservative by no means implies that it is reactionary; on the contrary, Dr. Butler distinctly believes that there is "a new education." In his use of the word "new" he is slightly vague. Dr. Johnson once distinguished the new, in the sense of the hitherto non-existent, the comparatively recent, and the hitherto unfamiliar: it is now of the one, now of the other, that Dr. Butler speaks. But he wisely writes of education as having discovered new standards, to which it is the duty of all its branches to conform. He iterates that teachers in all grades of education, as dealing primarily with mental processes, should nowadays have an accurate knowledge of psychology. He believes in the expansion of the curriculum, and repeatedly points out the anomaly in the fact that the designation "liberal," applied to study, means a narrow and technical course invented for a narrow and technical purpose and very imperfectly liberalized in the intervening centuries. He is a stanch friend of the humanities and classics, but he speaks of the constant fight even yet required to get much teaching from the economic and social point of view before high school and college—not university—students. They are thought too immature to study such recondite subjects, though the distinctions between Greek moods and tenses, the principles of conic sections, are given them as a matter of course. Finally, he is willing to call the waste in American education "frightful"; and he points out some ways of remedying a situation under which the American boy of twenty commonly knows less than the European boy of eighteen. Some of the utterances of President Butler on these subjects have lost part of their force, but most of them are still true.

Considering the fact that Dr. Butler has recently written a number of papers upon urgent and mooted questions in contemporary school management, it is to be regretted that they did not find representation, even at the cost of an exclusion of some of the older, more generalized essays in the volume. Thus he lately published a study of vocational education in which he took a determined stand against such attempts as

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that made in Illinois to place the vocational and non-vocational schools under two different administrations, labor and capital jointly controlling the former. He made clear the potential class-divisions of such an arrangement, its undemocratic nature. It would here have been more useful and cogent than—for example—his address of 1890 upon "The Secondary School Programme," which contains very much that is outworn. But President Butler plainly attempts to appeal to a very general audience. This fact is particularly evident in such long papers on "popular" topics as "Five Evidences of an Education" and "Standards." The five evidences of an education, as the author gives them, are correctness and precision in the use of the mother tongue, refined and gentle manners, the habit of reflection, the power to grow, and the power to do. Under standards he discusses ideals of personal conduct, bad habits of speech, including the use of newspaper English, self-mastery, and self-improvement. These discussions are placed upon an elevated and scholarly plane, are well phrased and full of literary allusion. But they remind us curiously of a mixture of Dr. Samuel Smiles and of the articles with which certain popular periodicals attempt to "uplift" the youth of the land; and for the audience Dr. Butler will reach—an audience mainly of educators, school administrators, and students of pedagogy—they might well have been replaced by articles of more narrowly definite cast.

President Butler's sub-title—his phrase describing his book as a contribution to a philosophy of education—finds justification only in a few chapters; those chapters, however, the most substantial of all. The initial essay is built upon John Fiske's theories of the part played, physiologically and psychologically, by the lengthening period of infancy in the animal species. From his study of human infancy as a period of prolonged plasticity required in order to bring about the proper adjustments to the complex life of humanity, Fiske concluded that it lay at the foundation of the human family, and therefore of human life. Dr. Butler develops Fiske's thought along another line. He reasons that the entire educational period after the physical adjustment has been made is an adjustment to spiritual environment, the building of harmonious and reciprocal relations with those acquisitions of the race which we call civilization: and that education must therefore be envisaged as resting upon the two cornerstones of the physical and psychical nature of the child, and the traditional, hereditary civilization of the race, before we have a conception of it in accord with the teachings of modern science and philosophy and with the doctrine of evolution. There is nothing strictly original in this: Spencer's views of education comprehended it. But as developed in this essay, and in "What Knowledge is Most Worth?" it enables him to formulate a sound and full definition of education as a foundation for his later theories.

Book Notes and Byways

A NOTABLE SALE OF BOOKS RELATING TO AMERICA.

Seldom does it fall to the lot of the bibliographer devoted to historical Americana to experience the pleasure of reading a catalogue such as that recently issued by Sotheby, Wilkinson & Hodge, London, England, describing 346 lots which were to have been sold at auction on August 15-17, but which were bought outright by Mr. George D. Smith, an American book dealer. These books, from the "renowned library at Britwell Court, Burnham, Bucks," were the property of Mr. S. R. Christie-Miller. The collection is here characterized as "magnificent"—and with good reason. A surprising number of treasures are enumerated. So rich, indeed, was the collection that a paragraph or two must be devoted to naming a few of the many items which have for the gatherer of early Americana an especial appeal. Few can purchase such volumes, but the *Nation* has numerous readers who take something more than an intelligent interest in bibliographical matters.

Historians wrangle over the redoubtable explorer, soldier, and colonizer, Capt. John Smith, but the discriminating collector still seeks the original editions of his works. No less than eight copies are here listed—"The General Historie of Virginia," 1624, 1626, 1627, and 1632; "The True Travels," 1630; "A Description of New England," 1616; "A True Relation," 1608; and "Advertisements for the Unexperienced Planters of New England," 1631. The last three are very rare, and the final item contains an impression of the original folded map in fine condition. A notable volume relating to Virginia is that containing nine tracts, including John Brereton's "Briefe and True Relation," 1602; Richard Hakluyt's translations from the Portuguese of "Virginia Richly Valued," 1609, and Capt. John Smith's "Map of Virginia," 1612. All nine tracts are described as being in perfect condition with the exception of Smith's "Map." There is also a copy—one of the very few in existence—of De Bry's edition of Thomas Hariot's "Briefe and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia," 1590. Many other works on early Virginia are listed, and I am sorely tempted to say something about them. But I must, perforce, pass on.

Our beginnings in New England are a favorite field of the collector of large means, and he doubtless found in this catalogue several items that created desire which nothing short of possession would appease. The Rev. William Hubbard, Minister at Ipswich, is represented by the Boston, 1677, edition of his "Narrative of the Troubles with the Indians in New England," containing the map of New England. This map is in "the finest condition possible, clean and crisp, the margins intact," and it is confidently stated that no finer copy can be in existence. A "perfect" copy of Hubbard's "Present State of New England," London, 1677, is also a desirable item. Edward Johnson's strange book, commonly known as "Wonder-Working Providence of Sions Saviour in New England," London, 1654, while not of excessive rarity, is still difficult to obtain. This is equally true of Thomas Lechford's "Plain Dealing," 1642. The present copy is especially fine, being uncut. There are many Mather items in the collection. That most curious of New England books, Thomas Morton's "New English Canaan," 1637, is always eagerly sought, as is the Boston, 1669, edition of Nathaniel Morton's "New England's Memoriall." William Wood's "New Englands Prospect," London, 1635, in good condition, is a most desirable bit of Americana.

The history of New France is also a well-worked field, and there were several "nuggets" of that class in Mr. Christie-Miller's collection—Samuel de Champlain's "Voyages et Descouvertes," 1620, and "Les Voyages de la Nouvelle France," 1632, also the first English edition, with original folded map, of Marc Lescarbot's "Nova Francia; or the Description of that Part of New France which is One Continent with Virginia," 1609.

The books written and compiled by that greatest of all documentary historians, Richard Hakluyt, to whom the English-speaking race owes so much, are always in demand. Here we have "The Principall Navigations," 1589, containing the rare folded map of the first issue; "Divers Voyages," 1582; and "The Principal Navigations" of 1599-1600. The latter has the original suppressed leaves of the "Voyage to Cadiz," and "a similar map to that in the Grenville copy." A fine copy of Samuel Purchas's "Hakluytus Posthumus," 1625-6, is always of interest to collectors.

The library contained a remarkable collection of fifty-two parts of the famous major and minor De Bry "Voyages," in Latin and German, "edited, translated, reprinted, and illustrated by Theodore De Bry, his widow and two sons, John Theodore and John Israel, and his two sons-in-law, Matthew Merian and William Fitzer."

JOHN THOMAS LEE.

Notes

Among the publications which are promised for September by George H. Doran Company is "My Table Cloths," by Mrs. Alec-Tweedie.

Houghton Mifflin Company will publish late in September and early in October "With the Turks in Palestine," by Alexander Aaronsohn; "Stories to Tell the Littlest Ones," by Sarah Cone Bryant.

The Century Company announces for publication shortly: "Gulliver the Great, and Other Dog Stories," by Walter Alden Dyer; "Wilson and the Issues," by George Creel; "The Dark Tower," by Phyllis Bottome. Juvenile: "Boyhood Stories of Famous Men," by Katherine D. Cather; "The Sapphire Signet," by Augusta Huiell Seaman; "The St. Nicholas Book of Plays and Operettas," second series, and "On the Battle-Front of Engineering," by A. Russell Bond.

Autumn publications of Moffat, Yard & Company include: "The Land of the Blue Flower," by Frances Hodgson Burnett, gift edition; "Her Golden Hours," Anonymous; "Shakespeare on the Stage," third series, by William Winter; "Football Days," by William E. Edwards; "Golf for Women," by a Woman Golfer; "Superwomen," by Albert Payson Terhune; "Handicrafts for the Handicapped," by Herbert J. Hall and Mertice M. C. Buck; "Wit and Its Relation to the Unconscious"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and "Leonardo Da Vinci," both by Sigmund Freud; "Analytical Psychology," by C. G. Jung; "Our Senses and What They Mean to Us," in ten volumes, Prof. George Van Ness Dearborn, editor-in-chief; "The Livable House Series," by Aymar Embury, II; "When the Sand-Man Comes," by Gertrude Alice Kay; "Plays for Home, School, and Settlement," by Virginia Olcott; "Model Aeroplanes and Their Motors," by George A. Cavanagh; "When Mother Lets Us Draw," by Emma R. Lee Thayer; "When Mother Lets Us Make Play-things," by G. Ellingwood Rich.

The Putnams will publish in September the following list: "The Cab of the Sleeping Horse," by John Reed Scott; "To the Minute," by Anna Katharine Green; "Connie Morgan in Alaska," by James B. Hendryx; "Betty Trevor" and "A College Girl," both by Mrs. George De Horne Vaizey; "Betty's Beautiful Nights," by Marion Warner Wildman Fenner; "The Seven Wonders of the Ancient World," by Edgar J. Banks; "The Fight for the Republic," by Rossiter Johnson; "The War and Humanity," by James M. Beck; "The Book of Winifred Maynard," Anonymous; "The Cambridge Book of Poetry for Children," edited by Kenneth Grahame; "Home Care of Consumptives," by Roy L. French. Also "Old Christmas," by Washington Irving, with color illustrations by Frank Dodd. This firm, acting as American representatives of the Cambridge University Press, announces: "Much Ado About Nothing," edited by J. H. Lobban; "Europe in the Nineteenth Century (1815-1878)," by John E. Morris; "Selections from the Poems of Samuel Taylor Coleridge," edited by A. Hamilton Thompson; "Domestic Science," Part II, by Charles W. Hale; "The Birds of Britain: Their Distribution and Habits," by A. H. Evans; "The Navy of the Restoration," by Arthur W. Tedder; "Architectural Building Construction," by Walter R. Jaggard.

The University of Chicago Press announces its forthcoming publications as follows: "The Control of Hunger in Health and Disease," by Anton J. Carlson; "A Guide to the Study of the Christian Religion," by Gerald Birney Smith; "Finite Collineation Groups" (the University of Chicago Science series), by Hand F. Blichfeldt; "Parallaxes of Twenty-seven Stars," by Frederick Slocum and Alfred Mitchell; "Exercises and Questions in Money and Banking," by Harold G. Moulton; "Exercises in Current Economics," by Walton H. Hamilton; "Second-Year Mathematics for Secondary Schools," by Ernst R. Breslich; "Teaching of High School Latin," by Josiah B. Game; "Slavery in Germanic Society," by Matilde Wergeland; "Review of the History of the Working Classes in France," by Matilde Wergeland; "Agricultural Economics," by Edwin G. Nourse; "Origin and Growth of the Hebrew Religion," by Henry Thatcher Fowler; "Gothic Architecture, the Art Institute of Chicago"; "The Psychology of Religion," by George A. Coe; "Quarter-Centennial Bibliography of Faculties," by a Committee of the Faculty of the University of Chicago; "Truancy and Non-Attendance in Chicago," by Sophonisba P. Breckinridge and Edith Abbott; "The Electron" (the University of Chicago Science series), by Robert Andrews Millikan.

Designed especially for the use of Camp Fire Girls, but also for those who wish to be informed on those matters pertaining to Indians which usually are misunderstood, is an illustrated booklet of seventy-eight pages by Florence M. Poast, of the Bureau of American Ethnology, Smithsonian Institution, bearing the title "Indian Names, Facts, and Games for Camp Fire Girls" (Washington, D. C.: James William Bryan Press; 75 cents). Brief information is given on language, symbolism, signs and signals, totems, fire-making, houses, occupations of women, clothing, children and their names, dolls, and games. A feature that will appeal to many is a list of several hundred Indian terms suitable for personal names, country seats, boats, etc.

In a light, attractively printed volume the Atlantic Monthly Company has collected sixteen essays which have appeared in its *Monthly* in recent years. If none of the essays gets far below the surface it is probably because the authors, like the commander of a submarine, find the surface more arresting than the deeper waters which essay and submarine alike are qualified to explore. This does not mean that the irritant of thought is absent from this volume. The book deals with a variety of subjects and each essay has at least a quasi-philosophic background which connects it with the type of essay that long ago established the *Atlantic's* reputation for good reading. To our mind the most able contribution is Miss Repplier's "Our Lady Poverty," in which she reinstates the respectability, and inspiration even, which reduced circumstances were once capable of. She has done a real service in thus obstructing the easy sentimentality of the reformer who nowadays makes of poverty a distressing, loathsome spectacle. Mr. Simeon Strunsky, with a sharp eye for what is as well as for what it means, gives a revealing glimpse of Broadway. Mrs. Gerould has some shrewd things to say about modern men. We like especially her perception of a certain effeminacy which appears to issue from over much brooding on reforms. "Fiddlers Errant" is, we take it, an autobiographical, as well as a delightful, account of the experiences of a man travelling alone with a 'cello. We have only sampled this volume for our readers, and in general the samples are not superior to the level of the other contributions.

Wallace in his lifetime poured out such a flood of self-revelation that only a few rills were left for James Marchant's volume, "Alfred Russel Wallace. Letters and Reminiscences" (Harper; $5 net). Yet it was well worth the making if only for giving the Darwin-Wallace correspondence, never before printed in its entirety. The letters fill 158 pages, and do infinite credit to both writers. Both were generous, both modest. Wallace admitted that his conception of the survival of the fittest came to him in a happy flash of inspiration; whereas Darwin had been working at it for twenty years; and always said that he would never have been capable of the immense industry that went into the "Origin of Species." But Darwin ranked Wallace as a co-discoverer, was profuse in acknowledgments of the aid derived from him, and for years was asking his help on difficult points connected with the theory of descent. He often said that he knew no man like Wallace for answering hard questions. He greatly admired Wallace's clear style, and when told of the birth of a son named after Herbert Spencer, said that he hoped the boy would write like his father rather than like his namesake. Throughout the exchange of letters, Darwin appears as the more massive intellect and the steadier reasoner. But in point of character, neither had the advantage over the other. For the rest, the book is made up of a selection of Wallace's letters on scientific topics, with a sprinkling of others about social reform and spiritualism, and so on. Pleasant glimpses of his home life are given, and minor recollections from various pens are included. The editing is done with discretion, though a few of the introductory passages and an occasional running comment offend by a sort of clerical gushing. To the Rev. Mr. Marchant, it is evident, Wallace was as inspired when he was freakish as when he was scientific.

Gamaliel Bradford's "Union Portraits" (Houghton Mifflin; $1.50 net) comprises nine character studies of military and civil leaders of the Civil War period. The first two sketches, of McClellan and Hooker, elicited, when first published in the *Atlantic*, some adverse comment, and Mr. Bradford has modified somewhat the opinion of Hooker which he first expressed. As to McClellan, on the other hand, he stands his ground, being still unable to agree with those who think that "if McClellan had not been persistently thwarted by Lincoln, and especially by Stanton, he would have crushed the rebellion and ended the war two years earlier." The remaining essays deal with Meade, Thomas, Sherman, Stanton, Seward, Sumner, and Bowles. Mr. Bradford exhibits both keenness and skill in the presentation of personal traits, although what he has to say is couched in language which at times is familiar to the verge of triviality. To Magruder's charge that Hooker "was essentially a mean man and a liar" he retorts: "Hooker did mean things and made false statements. So have you. So have I. But it is not just, I hope, to call you a liar, nor me, nor Hooker, with all the grave implications of the word." This, of course, is only playing to the gallery, and neither proves nor disproves Magruder's charge. As a whole, however, the characterizations are illuminating and fair. Meade, for example, exhibits an instinct of duty, sacrifice, and patriotism, high intelligence, candor, and modesty, joined to "a marked inability to win men" and an irritable temper. To be remembered as the victor of Gettysburg is, in Mr. Bradford's opinion, sufficient glory for any man. With Stanton, on the other hand, the problem is "how he could be so disagreeable and so successful"; the answer being found, apparently, in Stanton's tremendous energy, his organizing power, his moral and physical courage, and his lofty patriotism. Of the civilian "portraits" the best is that of Sumner, the man of "a magnificent tongue and one idea," "essentially a voice delivering the message of his time on a great moral question."

Few Frenchmen have left more interesting and self-revealing sayings than Napoleon. "Adversity is the midwife of genius." "Love is folly committed by two." "It is imagination which loses battles." "A good philosopher makes a bad citizen." "The man the least free is the man bound to party." These and several hundred other of his truths and half-truths were collected and classified by Jules Bertaut. They have been translated by H. E. Law and C. L. Rhodes as "Napoleon: In His Own Words" (McClurg; $1). The collec-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion does not pretend to be complete nor to add anything new, but it is sufficient to mirror the man of action in a striking way. The aphorisms, of course, lack consistency and continuity, because Napoleon had no profound moral convictions. He was no philosopher developing a system of philosophy nor a publicist seeking to mould events by political reason. He was a man of action who spoke for the immediate effect which his words might accomplish—a Roman Catholic in France and a Mohammedan in Egypt. "Simpletons talk of the past, wise men of the present, and fools of the future." The translations are good, but many a reader would like to have the date, chapter, and verse cited; for half the significance of a saying often lies in the occasion on which it was uttered.

Art

A VORTICIST SCULPTOR.

Gaudier-Brzeska, A Memoir. By Ezra Pound. New York: John Lane Co. Illustrated. $3.50 net.

Gaudier-Brzeska, the vorticist sculptor, was killed in the French trenches at the young age of twenty-five. He left in London, where he passed the last four or five years of his roving life, an extraordinary impression both as an artist and as a thinker. As a contributor to *Blast* he had his part in formulating the programme of vorticism. The poet Ezra Pound now devotes a considerable volume to the memory of his friend, examining at large both the work of Gaudier and its relation to older and newer movements of thought. For a mere pot-pourri, and despite its eccentric jargon, the book is instructive. It reveals the British attitude towards the new "pure" art. Characteristically that attitude is as muddled as enthusiastic. It is based rather on contempt of naturalism than on any clear vision of reform. Indeed, most of British new art may be traced to more or less intelligent imitation of Far Eastern, or negro prototypes.

That Gaudier-Brzeska was of no common talent his writings, drawings, and sculptures sufficiently attest. At an impressionable age he was cast into the chaos of modern artistic Paris. He learned to despise the Greeks and the Renaissance, and readily let himself be drawn and perturbed by Rodin, Mailloly, Matisse, Epstein, the neolithic drawings, and negro sculpture. This æsthetic mess he finally reduced to a kind of order by inventing the formula, which as a sort of testament he wrote from the trenches to *Blast:*

"I shall derive my emotions solely from the arrangement of surfaces, I shall present my emotions by the arrangement of my surfaces, the planes and lines by which they are defined."

When Gaudier penned these words his work was over. The sculpture which corresponds to this formula is in essence cubistic—prismatic forms with powerfully balanced and highly simplified planes. The Dancer and the group Caritas and the composition Birds-Erect represent this ultimate phase. In all these cases the sculptor manifests a perverse power. But the emotion which, according to programme, results from these arranged planes is fanatical and overdone. Emotion and rhetoric are alike coarse. We agree with Mr. Pound that these late works are the most original, highly dosed as they are with negro sculpture. Yet Gaudier appears in a more amiable vein in the exquisite pen drawings of stags, inspired by the cave-men paintings, and in the early naturalistic torso now at South Kensington. Remarkable, too, is the relief of a cat now in a New York collection.

The man had the valor of his fanaticism and evidently the charm of romantic revolt. His error was the common one of denying the complexity of the mind and work of the artist. He indulged *à outrance* in the futile and pathetic quest of a simplicity and concentration which are life denying. He succeeded somewhat, despite his frail maxims, for he had force and passion.

He deserves a better fate than to be maundered about by an unvenerable *Imagiste* who has no better generalization to offer anent Greek art than that its ruling characteristic is to be "caressable."

Finance

OUR MARKETS AND DURATION OF THE WAR.

The news, last Monday, of Rumania's entry into the European war on the side of the Allies had prompt effect on the markets. The price of wheat broke violently; no doubt because of inference that the resultant crushing of Turkey would open the Dardanelles and release the grain of Russia. The stock market also declined on the immediate announcement; partly, perhaps, because of a feeling that the end of the war and the economic uncertainties of peace were now near at hand.

But predictions of a consequent early ending of the war were taken in well-informed circles with great reserve. Among the numerous explanations—first for the stock market's recent refusal to get alarmed over the poor harvests and the threats of organized labor, and next, for its enthusiastic outburst of last week—there was one which has been little discussed, yet which has been in everybody's mind. This is the growing conviction that the war is not nearly over.

The world has passed through what must have been the inevitable successive phases of hope, doubt, and expectation regarding duration of all such conflicts as that which is now in progress. The histories do not tell us what were the similar fluctuations of opinion, say in our Civil War or in England's war with Napoleon. It would be interesting to know, especially of the older war, just when and in what form such changes of opinion asserted themselves. There must have been some week or month—perhaps in the year of Chancellorsville or Austerlitz—when predictions were in the ascendant that neither physical endurance nor financial endurance could keep up the fight much longer. Dates must have been fixed at which "economic exhaustion" would settle the matter.

Sudden recurrence of rumors of "secret peace negotiations" would naturally come next; we know they did in Civil War times, and, though it is difficult to find record of them in the first ten years of the Napoleonic wars, the newspapers and the stock exchanges would surely have repeated them. Then, somewhat later, there must have come a time when the whole community suddenly reached the conclusion that the end was not in sight, that this was to be a much longer war than any one had imagined, and that the single duty left was to make full preparation for it. This is the stage of discussion and expectation which the European belligerents, and with them the rest of the world, now seem to have reached. It is natural that, with a neutral country like our own, the inquiry should follow, what would be the effect on finance and industry, if war conditions should be greatly prolonged?

The answer is partly to be found in some very recent incidents. Last week's announcement, that a new "commercial credit" of $25,000,000 had been extended to a group of French bankers by New York bankers, was received by the financial community almost as a matter of course. Very little surprise was expressed that this advance should follow so soon after the three-year $100,000,000 French credit of last month, and the two-year "collateral loan" of $250,000,000 to Great Britain, public subscriptions to which were closed last Saturday, only ten days after the offering of the loan.

These remarkable operations make it possible to say that within slightly more than a month loans placed by the belligerents in the United States have amounted to more than one-third the total amount so placed since the war began. About the middle of June, Russia obtained a credit of $50,000,000 in New York, backed by a reciprocal credit of 150,000,000 rubles in Petrograd. In July came the French secured loan of $100,000,000, floated through the medium of the American Foreign Securities Corporation. A fortnight ago there were underwritten, and last week offered to the public, $250,000,000 of British two-year notes, and last week there was announced the commercial credit of $25,000,000 to France.

These four loans, with the Anglo-French flotation of last autumn, make up the bulk of our advances to belligerent Europe. Other advances include the $50,000,000 credit to a group of British banks shortly after the Anglo-French operation, for the specific purpose of steadying the exchange market. France sold $30,000,000 notes here in April, 1915, and obtained, in addition, 90 or 95 millions in the form of special credits. Ger-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many sold $10,000,000 notes in America, and it was estimated that German war bonds were taken in this country to the extent of $25,000,000. Italy also recently disposed of $25,000,000 notes in the American market. Russian "acceptances" some time ago amounted to more than $30,000,000.

In all, belligerent Europe has obtained advances in the United States since the outbreak of the war of more than 1,200 million dollars. In addition, we have lent the Canadian Government and Canadian provinces and municipalities probably $225,000,000. Neutral Europe and South America, moreover, whose banking is usually done in London or Paris, have become our debtors to the extent of $135,000,000.

While these transactions were being carried out, the American money market remained at abnormally low rates, and the New York surplus bank reserve held at a figure never matched before the war. Meantime, also, our enormous export trade to the outside world continues. During the months of May, June, and July, in 1915, our surplus of exports over imports rose to $367,000,000, far surpassing every previous record. In the same months of 1916 the export surplus was $724,000,000. The one sure answer, therefore, to the question what results prolongation of the war would have on American finance, is that such prolongation would lead to further enormous increase in our loans to belligerent Europe and the outside world; to further redemption of our own securities from Europe, and therefore to the strengthening, in a very substantial way, of our position as a creditor nation for the period after war.

Just how all this, with continuance of our large export trade, would bear on the argument of "temporary prosperity," of which we have already heard much in the political campaign, and of which we shall hear a vast deal more, is a highly interesting question. It is interesting enonomically, because the most experienced prophets disagree as to our future in the aftermath of war. It is interesting politically, because it will show how far the voter, who traditionally imputes his existing prosperity to the party in power, will conclude that the visible good times are of no great account, because they cannot last forever.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

FICTION.

Anderson, S. Windy McPherson's Son. Lane. $1.40 net.
Deland, M. The Rising Tide. Harper. $1.35 net.
Dodge, L. Bonnie May. Scribner. $1.35 net.
Hilton-Turvey, C. The Van Haavens. Small, Maynard. $1.35 net.
Johnson, O. The Woman Gives. Little, Brown. $1.40 net.
King, G. The Pleasant Ways of St. Medard. Holt. $1.40 net.
Lea, F. H. Chloe Malone. Little, Brown. $1.35 net.
Lynd, S. The Chorus—A Tale of Love and Folly. Dutton. $1.35 net.
Moore, G. The Brook Kerith. Macmillan. $1.50 net.
Van Schaick, G. The Girl at Big Loon Post. Small, Maynard. $1.35 net.

MISCELLANEOUS.

King, B. P. The Worth of a Girl. Crowell. 25 cents net.
Forty-first Annual Report of the Minister of State for Education. 1913-14. Tokio, Japan: Department of Education.
Perry, R. B. The Free Man and the Soldier. Scribner. $1.40 net.
Work, M. N. Negro Year Book, 1916-17. Negro Year Book Pub. Co.

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY.

Spalding, J. H. The Kingdom of Heaven Seen by Swedenborg. Dutton. $1.50 net.

GOVERNMENT AND ECONOMICS.

What's the Matter with New York. Told by John A. Hennesssy. New York: The O'Connell Press.

BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORY.

Bishop, F. Our First War in Mexico. Scribner. $1.25 net.
Naumann, F. Central Europe. Introduction by W. J. Ashley. Translated by C. M. Meredith. London: King & Son.
Ransom, W. L. Charles E. Hughes: The Statesman as Shown in the Opinions of the Jurist. Dutton. $1.50 net.
William Newton Clarke: A Biography with Additional Sketches by His Friends and Colleagues. Scribner. $2 net.

POETRY.

Jennings, J. G. Metaphor in Poetry. Charles E. Merrill.

DRAMA.

Representative English Plays from the Middle Ages to the End of the Nineteenth Century. Edited by J. S. P. Tatlock and R. G. Martin. Century. $2.50 net.

ART.

Shakespeare in Pictorial Art. Edited by Charles Holme. Lane. $2.50 net.

TEXTBOOKS.

Selections from the Prose of Macaulay. Edited by L. H. Holt. Boston: Ginn. $1.25 net.

Barber's First Course in General Science

By FREDERIC D. BARBER, Professor of Physics in the Illinois State Normal University; MERTON L. FULLER, Lecturer on Meteorology in the Bradley Polytechnic Institute; JOHN L. PRICER, Professor of Biology in the Illinois State Normal University, and HOWARD W. ADAMS, Professor of Chemistry in the same. vii+588 pp. of text. 12mo. $1.25.

This manual for the first year of the high school is based on the conviction that at this stage the work in science should emphasize the physical aspects and animal and plant life, with personal and community welfare the crucial point of attack.

One of the strong points of the book is its scientific accuracy. Each of the authors has made definite and material contribution, so that the volume represents the carefully arranged work of specialists in physics, chemistry, meteorology, and biology. This fact will do much to place an elementary course in general science on the high plane which it deserves.

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY
34 W. 33d St., NEW YORK — 6 Park St., BOSTON — 623 So. Wabash Av., CHICAGO

From Mons to Ypres with General French

A Personal Narrative, By FREDERIC COLEMAN

"To read Mr. Coleman's leisurely personal narrative is as near to having the actual experience of living and working in the battle zone as, perhaps, it is possible to get out of a book."—*New York Times.*

With fifty illustrations from photographs taken by the author. $1.50 net.

DODD, MEAD & COMPANY, NEW YORK

BIG BOOK CATALOG FREE
Books of General and Special Interest
THE JOHN C. WINSTON COMPANY
903 Winston Building — Philadelphia

THE LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY
THE IDEA OF MR. JAMES LOEB

A New, Comprehensive and Uniform Series of Greek and Latin Texts, in handy volumes.

With Parallel English Translations

60 vols. now ready—15 in active preparation, 46 under way.

Per vol. cloth $1.50. Leather $2.00.

The Series is to contain all that is best in Literature from the time of Homer to the fall of Constantinople.

Send for 16-page Descriptive Pamphlet

G. P. Putnam's Sons, 2 West 45th St., N.Y. Just West of 5th Av.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Lists of Publications in sciences, philosophy, philology, history, economics, will be sent upon request.

The University of California Press
BERKELEY, CAL.

TO RUHLEBEN AND BACK
By GEOFFREY PYKE

A thrilling story of a young Englishman's experiences in Germany during the present war. "It is a book of adventure of captivating quality."—*New York Tribune.* *Illustrated.* $1.50 *net.*

Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston

The Modern Criminal Science Series. Vol. VIII

CRIMINALITY AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS
By WILLIAM A. BONGER

"This work will promote wide discussion and stimulate thought on the subject, for it hits fearlessly at the roots of society and deals interestingly with a subject that concerns all. The deductions are those of a master and are supported by carefully compiled statistics and data."—*Brooklyn Eagle.*

8vo. Cloth. 738 pages. $5.50 net.

LITTLE, BROWN & COMPANY, BOSTON

THE CIVILIZATION OF BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA

By MORRIS JASTROW, Jr., Professor of Semitic Languages, Univ. of Pennsylvania. 164 *illustrations. Handsome Library Cl. 8vo. in box. Net, $6.*

The only book on the subject treating of the entire civilization of these ancient nations—languages, laws, religions, customs, buildings, etc.—other books have treated only partial phases of the subject.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY, PHILADELPHIA

By Lajpat Rai
A Leader of the Indian Nationalist Movement

Young India

An Interpretation and a History of the Nationalist Movement from Within

With 8 portraits. At all bookstores, $1.50 net.

B. W. Huebsch, Publisher New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED